Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/synagoguechurch0000josh

THE

SYNAGOGUE AND THE CHURCH.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE SYNAGOGUE

AND

THE CHURCH,

BEING

AN ATTEMPT TO SHOW, THAT THE GOVERNMENT, MINISTERS,
AND SERVICES OF THE CHURCH,
WERE DERIVED FROM THOSE OF THE SYNAGOGUE.

Condensed from the Original Latin Work of Vitringa.

BY

JOSHUA L. BERNARD, A.M.

CURATE OF ST. MARY'S, DONNYBROOK.

"Look to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged."

Rev. J. Jones's
Private Library. No. 497

LONDON:

B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE STREET.

1842.

LIBRARY OF
Beaubrake Theological Seminary

BM
653
.V5
1842

4208

PREFACE.

Nothing is of more importance than that we should have right notions respecting a Christian Church,—its Ministry and Services,—if we would avoid the extremes of disregarding Church ordinances on the one hand, or of unduly extolling them on the other. Grievous errors are likely to be introduced by mistaken notions on this point: "there are some persons who, from not finding in Scripture precise directions, and strict commands, as to the constitution and regulation of a Christian Church,—the several orders of Christian Ministers,—the distinct functions of each,—and such other details, have adopted the conclusion, or at least seem to lean more or less to the conclusion,—that it is a matter entirely left to each individual's fancy or conveni-

ence to join one Christian society or another, or none at all; to take upon himself, or confer on another, the ministerial office, or to repudiate altogether any Christian ministry whatever; to join, or withdraw from, any, or every religious assembly for joint Christian worship, according to the suggestion of his individual taste." "There are others who think that we are bound to seek for a distinct authoritative sanction, in the Scriptures, or in some other ancient writings,—some tradition, in short, for each separate point which we would maintain. They assume that whatever doctrines or practices, whatever institutions, whatever regulations respecting Church government, we can conclude, either with certainty or with any degree of probability, to have been either introduced by the Apostles, or to have prevailed in their time, or in the time of their immediate successors, are to be considered as absolutely binding on all Christians for ever—as a model from which no Church is at liberty to depart." [a]

[a] Archbishop Whately's Kingdom of Christ, pages 110, 111.

On this point, as on many others, Scripture has given us no direct information in a systematic form; there are, indeed, incidental allusions to it, and we find a divine sanction clearly given to regular Christian communities; but we have no express declaration as to what should be their constitution. It will be of use, then, to inquire into the constitution and practices of the Jewish Synagogue, and to ascertain whether, and how far, Christian Churches were formed on that model—were, in fact, of the character of *Christianized Synagogues.*

This has been very generally overlooked (at least in the present day), and hence little knowledge or curiosity respecting Synagogues is to be found, and the Temple being imagined by some to be the model of Christian Churches, the ministry and services of the Church have been exalted in a manner quite inconsistent with the religion of Jesus; thus in direct opposition to Scripture, Christian Churches have been called *Temples*—the ministers, *Priests* (HIEREIS, *Sacerdotes*)—the communion tables,

Altars—and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a *Sacrifice*.[b] It is of the utmost importance, then, that we should endeavour to ascertain what was the model adopted by the Apostles in the constitution of the Church; they were Jews, and as such likely to follow the customs of their nation; they had the choice between the Temple and the Synagogue; which did they adopt? As such important consequences follow, much interest attaches to the inquiry.

Some have alleged that those who trace the constitution of the Christian Church to the Synagogue, are at variance among themselves as to the precise constitution of the Synagogue; they certainly disagree, in some minor points of detail, but not so as to affect the present inquiry; and indeed it is evident that the disagreement or uncertainty as to the minor points gives additional weight to their authority in respect to the points (and they are the principal) in which they are clearly and fully agreed.

[b] See Index to the Tracts for the Times, a most valuable work to those who wish an acquaintance with their doctrines.

Vitringa, who has prosecuted this inquiry with much diligence and much success, was born at Lewarden, in Friesland, in the year 1659. At an early age he learned Greek and Hebrew, and acquired such a knowledge of these languages, as to be able to read the Scriptures in the originals. At the age of sixteen he went to Franeker, and read the usual course of Philosophy. A desire to be under the professors of the University of Leyden brought him to that city, where he took his degree in 1679: the year after he was admitted to the ministry, and almost immediately was called to the chair of Oriental languages. In 1682 he obtained that of theology, and in 1693 he was made also professor of sacred history. He passed the last years of his life in constant suffering, and died of apoplexy, in 1722, aged sixty-three years, leaving behind him several works, the most important of which is that now presented to the public in a condensed form. He was a learned, acute, industrious, candid writer; but as he wrote for the learned world, his work is in Latin, as most such

books of that period are; it is extremely prolix, entering upon the discussion of questions uninteresting to the generality of readers, and digressing upon points quite unconnected with his subject; hence the utility of an abridged translation.

The Editor has added a few references to other authors, and some explanatory remarks. The result of attentive study of the work has convinced him that it is very valuable, and especially for *these times*.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE SYNAGOGUE.

CHAPTER I.

Signification of the words Synagogue and Church . . . p. 1.

Meaning of the word *Synagogue*—of the word *Church*. The words Church and Synagogue used in a twofold sense, 2.

CHAPTER II.

Jewish Places of Prayer . . . p. 4.

Jewish places of prayer of two kinds—Synagogues were built upon elevated ground—sometimes outside cities and near some river, 5; sometimes near sepulchres—were frequently without any roof, 7; should be built wherever there were ten men of full age and free condition, 8. The dedication of a Synagogue, 9. Many Synagogues frequently in the same city, 10; Synagogues sometimes in private houses—Private places for prayer, 11; their windows opened toward Jerusalem, 13.

CHAPTER III.

The Schools . . . p. 14.

Jewish Schools of two kinds—the Public Schools—the Councils—formation of Schools, 15; Customs of the Schools—mode of teaching, 16. Reverence paid to Schools—mention of Schools in the times of the Kings, 17; Schools of the Prophets; sometimes in cities, sometimes on mountains, sometimes in the wilderness—the sons of the Prophets, 18. Origin of the Schools of the Prophets, 19; Prophecy not always a prediction of the future, 20.

CHAPTER IV.

The Origin of the Synagogue . . . p. 23.

Synagogues very ancient—Public worship before the Deluge—Worship in the times of the Patriarchs, 24. Jewish writers derive the Synagogue from the times of Moses, 25. Holy Convocation on the Sabbath, not the origin of the Synagogue. The Tabernacle of the Congregation no foundation for the Synagogue, 27; Israelites should worship only where Jehovah had placed his name, 28; Public worship neither enjoined nor provided for in the books of Moses, 30. No proof of the existence of the Synagogue in the times of the Judges, 31. Meaning of the phrase—"before the Lord," 32. The Synagogue did not exist in the times of the Kings, as appears—First, from the Lamentations of Jeremiah, 33. Secondly, from the observance of Fasts in the Temple, 34. Thirdly, from the prevailing Idolatry of these times, 35. Fourthly, from the Mission of Jehoshaphat. Fifthly, from the wonder and fear of Josiah at the finding of the book of the Law, 36. Sixthly, from the duties assigned to the Levites, 38. Objection from a passage in the Psalms, 39. The Synagogue dates its origin from the times of Ezra. This appears, First, from the number

of copies of the Scriptures in these times, 41. Secondly, from the number of Scribes, 42. Thirdly, from the public reading of the Law. First Synagogues were most probably in Gentile Countries, 43.

CHAPTER V.

The Furniture of the Synagogue . . . p. 44.

Principal articles of Furniture four in number. I. The Ark. II. The Pulpit. III. The Seats. IV. The Lamps, 46. Lights burned in private houses. Minor articles of Furniture were—I. The Sacred Volume, 48. II. The Trumpets, 49. III. The Veil. IV. The Alms Chests, 52. Libraries attached to Synagogues.

CHAPTER VI.

The Government of the Synagogue . . . p. 53.

In early ages regal and judicial offices united. Every Jewish city of repute had its council of Presbyters or Elders; as appears from the History of Susannah, 54; from Philo—from Josephus—from Maimonides—from Benjamin of Tudela—Synagogues sometimes governed by one Rabbi, 57. Government of Modern Synagogues, 58. The New Testament confirms this account of the Government of the Synagogue, 59.

CHAPTER VII.

The Discipline of the Synagogue . . . p. 60.

Punishments of the Synagogue of two kinds—Excommunication—Excommunicated person excluded from the Synagogue, 62. Power of excommunicating rested with the Council, 63. Allusion to excommunication in the New Testament—the punishment when first inflicted, 64. Flagellation in the Synagogue, 65. Why our Lord was never excommunicated, 67.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Alms collected in the Synagogue . . . p. 69.

Hebrew word, signifying righteousness, used also for Alms—reason for this. Relief given to the poor, either compulsory or voluntary, 71. Origin of voluntary relief, 73. Alms were collected in the Synagogue for a twofold purpose. Origin of the custom of transmitting Alms to Judæa, 74. Distribution of the Alms collected in the Synagogue, 77.

CHAPTER IX.

The Presbyters of the Synagogue . . . p. 78.

Election of the Presbyters of a Synagogue—at first lay with the Civil Governor, 79; afterwards with the Sanhedrim, 80; who invariably consulted the people, 81. Election of Presbyters in Modern Synagogues. Manner of ordination, 82. The President of the Synagogue and his Presbyters of the same order, 83; Salaries of the Presbyters, 85; their privileges.

CHAPTER X.

The Chazzans, or Deacons of the Synagogue . . . p. 87.

Every Synagogue had its Chazzan. His duties were—1. To take the book of the Law from the Ark. 2. To call out the readers. 3. To stand by them. 4. To blow the trumpet, 88. 5. To wave the napkin. 6. To take care of the Synagogue, 89. The Legate of the Church—the President was, *ex officio*, the Legate. In modern Synagogues, the Chazzan is the Legate. The election of Chazzans, 90. Chazzans of the Council—of the Temple, 92; of cities.

CHAPTER XI.

The Discourses delivered in the Synagogue . . . p. 93.

Preaching usual in the Synagogue—nature of the Discourses delivered in the Synagogue—they were highly allegorical, 96; very fabulous, 97; sometimes in parables, 98. Name given to the Discourses delivered in the Synogogue, 100. Persons privileged or permitted to preach.

CHAPTER XII.

The Ritual of the Synagogue.

I. The Form of Prayer . . . . . p. 103.

Prayers used in the Synagogue of two kinds—the Public Liturgy of the Synagogue consisted principally of two formulæ. 1. The Schemah, 104. Allusion to the Schemah in the Gospel of St. Luke. 2. The Schemon-Esre, 105. The nineteen Eulogies of the Schemon-Esre—the Schemon-Esre may be divided into three parts, 113; shorter form used instead of the Schemon-Esre—Order of Prayer, 111. Order of Private prayer—Morning—Evening. Order of Public prayer, 118.—Morning prayer—the Kaddisch—Afternoon prayer, 121.—Evening prayer. Order of prayer on Sabbath and Festival-days, 122. Three services in the Synagogue during the day—the Benediction pronounced in the Synagogue, 123; Form, when no Priest was present, 124.

II. The Reading of the Law and the Prophets . . p. 124.

Manner of reading the Law—Doxology before—after—Scrupulous accuracy of the Jews when reading the Law, 125; qualifications required in those who read in the Synagogue, 127;

preference given to a Priest or Levite—Interpretation of the Law, 129. Five passages never interpreted—Manner of reading the Prophets, 131; when read, 133; number of Verses read—Hagiographa seldom read, 134. Mention of the reading of the Law and the Prophets in the New Testament.

PART II.

THE CHURCH COMPARED WITH THE SYNAGOGUE.

CHAPTER I.

Probable Source from which the Apostles derived the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church . . . p. 135.

No form of Government or of Worship prescribed in Scripture for the Christian Church—Strong presumption that the Apostles would introduce (as much as possible) Jewish Customs, 136; a presumption, that the Apostles took the Synagogue for their Model, and not the Temple, 138.

CHAPTER II.

Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue as Places of Prayer . . . p. 139.

Churches and Synagogues used for similar purposes—called by the same names, 140; built in a similar manner—similarly dedicated, 141; might be built in any place, 142. In later times both were assimilated to the Temple, 143. Minor points of agreement, 144.

CHAPTER III.

The Government of the Early Church compared with that of the Synagogue. . . . p. 145.

The Church, as well as the Synagogue, governed by a Council—these Councils similar—in the name given to their members—in the qualifications required in the members—in their constitution, 149. At first all Churches were under the control of the Church at Jerusalem—in after-times all Churches independent, 151. New Titles sprang up in the Church in the second and third centuries, 155. The Church and Synagogue each passed through three different states as to Government, 157.

CHAPTER IV.

The Discipline of the Early Church compared with that of the Synagogue. . . . p. 159.

Excommunication a punishment of the Christian Church—enjoined and enforced by the Apostle Paul, 160; continued to be inflicted in after-ages, 163. Analogy between Excommunication as inflicted in the Church and in the Synagogue.

CHAPTER V.

Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue as to the Collection and Distribution of Alms. . . . p. 166.

Much Alms-giving in the Early Church—Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue in this respect, 167.

CHAPTER VI.

The Presbyters of the Church compared with those of the Synagogue. . . . p. 169.

The Apostles had absolute power in the selection of Ministers—in after-times the people were always consulted—agreement

between the Church and the Synagogue in the election and ordination of Ministers, 172. Stipend of Presbyters.

CHAPTER VII.

Orders of Ministers in the Early Church. . . . p. 177.

The Presidents of the Presbyteries of the Church assumed to themselves exclusively the title of Bishops—this supposition the only way of reconciling Ecclesiastical History with Scripture—argument of those who contend for a threefold order in the times of the Apostles, 179. Analogy contended for, untenable—orders in the Early Church determined from the Analogy of the Synagogue, 182. Controversy a verbal one, 183.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Deacons of the Church compared with those of the Synagogue. . . . p. 186.

Analogy between the Chazzans and the Deacons—as to names—as to offices, 187. Objection.—The seven officers mentioned in the sixth of Acts not Deacons, 188. Number of Deacons—appointment of Deacons, 193. The Bishop, the Angel or Legate of the Christian Church.

CHAPTER IX.

The Discourses delivered in the Early Christian Church compared with those delivered in the Synagogue. . . . p. 195.

Analogy between these Discourses—in names—in manner of delivery—in style, 196; as to place—as to time—as to persons permitted to preach, 197. Women forbidden to preach, 198. Doctors sat when preaching, 199.

CHAPTER X.

The Public Worship of the Early Church compared with that of the Synagogue. . . . p. 200.

No Liturgy of the Early Church handed down—Prayers of the Early Church similar to those of the Synagogue—similar formulæ in both—Customs of the Synagogue introduced into the Church, 202. Responses and ejaculations of the Church similar to those of the Synagogue, 204. Worship in the Church and Synagogue three times a day, 205. The reading of the Scriptures in the Church.

CHAPTER XI.

Refutation of the Arguments of those who derive the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church from the Temple. . . . p. 208.

Archbishop Usher's opinion as to the origin of Church Government—is supported by the authority of the Fathers, 210. Reasons that probably induced the Fathers to institute a comparison between the Church and the Temple, 211. The Analogy between Priests and Levites, and between Bishops and Deacons, no foundation for deriving the Church from the Temple, 214. Analogy between the duties of the Priests and Levites and those of the Bishops and Deacons, not sufficient to prove the derivation of the Church from the Temple, 215. The designation of Christian Worship by phrases borrowed from the Temple, no foundation, 217; meaning of such phrases, 218. The forms of the Temple the Shadow, the reality in the Church, 221. The Ministers of the New Dispensation being called Priests, no foundation for deriving the orders of the Church from the Temple, 223. Varied application of the word Priest in the Christian Church, 224. Analogy between Ministers of the Christian Church and the Jewish Priests, very slight, 229.

APPENDIX.

Note A. Whether the Proseucha was distinct from the Synagogue 237
B. The Libertines 239
C. Jewish love of Antiquity 240
D. The Sabbath 241
E. In what sense the Levites were the Teachers of Israel 244
F. On the titles Rab, Rabbi, &c., given to Jewish Doctors 246
G. On the Feast of Tabernacles 250
H. The Recitation of the Schemah 251
I. Whether the Septuagint Version was read in the Synagogue 252
K. Meaning of the Phrase—"Husband of one Wife" 253
L. On Church Government 255

ERRATUM.

In page 56, *for* "Benjamin of Toledo" *read* "Benjamin of Tudela.

THE

SYNAGOGUE AND THE CHURCH.

PART I.

THE SYNAGOGUE.

CHAPTER I.

Signification of the Words Synagogue and Church.

Meaning of the word Synagogue.

THE Greek word translated Synagogue, signifies, simply, an assembly, without any reference to the character or motives of the individuals assembled. The Septuagint translators use the word in this sense; they apply it not only to the people of Israel legally convened, but also to the rebellious company that followed Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.

Meaning of the word Church.

The word translated Church, (ECCLESIA,) on the contrary, always conveys some idea of the nature of the assembly; it answers to the Hebrew word KAHAL, which denotes an assembly legally

convened. Thus the Jewish people, when assembled as a body politic to receive the law, are called KAHAL;[a] and St. Stephen, referring to this assembly, styles it ECCLESIA;[b] nay, more, the turbulent crowd in the temple of Diana at Ephesus, is also called ECCLESIA,[c] because it was a legal assembly.

In the New Testament, the word ECCLESIA is used in an extended, and also in a limited sense; it signifies the whole Christian community, the entire body of believers,—governed by one Spirit, united by one faith, with one supreme head, Jesus Christ, in heaven; it is also applied to the Christian community in one city, or even to the congregation accustomed to assemble in one house;[d] but still, in every case, a legal bond of union, enters into the idea conveyed by the word. The followers of Christ may be so dispersed, so scattered throughout the world, as to have no opportunity of meeting together; they then cease to be a congregation (SUNAGOGE), but they do not cease to be a Church (ECCLESIA); they have still their legal bond of union, they have still the same Head, they are united by the same faith, supported by the same hope.

The words Church and Synagogue used in a twofold sense.

Nothing is more usual in classic authors, than for the same word, to signify, sometimes the

[a] Deut. ix. 10. [b] Acts viii. 38.
[c] Acts xix. 32. [d] Philemon. 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

assembly itself, sometimes the place of assembling; thus we read "frequens curia," *a full meeting of the senate;* "parietes hujus curiæ," *the walls of this senate house.* The Greek words rendered Synagogue, and Church, have also this twofold signification. It is, however, to be remarked, that in the New Testament, the word Synagogue signifies in general, the place of assembling,[e] whereas the word Church, (with perhaps a single exception,[f]) is used to denote, not the place of assembling, but the believing servants of Christ, congregated together for the worship of God, and for mutual edification.

[e] Luke xviii. 20. Matt. vii. 5. [f] 1 Cor. xi. 22.

CHAPTER II.

Jewish Places of Prayer.

Jewish places of prayer two-fold.

THE Jewish places of prayer were of two kinds:—those for public prayer, called in general Synagogues;[a] those for private prayer, which were usually rooms set apart for the purpose, in the upper stories of private dwellings.

The synagogue built upon elevated ground.

The synagogue should be built upon the most elevated ground in the neighbourhood, and should be higher than all other buildings.[b] The observance of this rule was considered of the utmost importance, there being a vulgar notion, "that total destruction awaited every city whose houses were higher than its synagogue." A feeling of reverence may have dictated this rule; a feeling that it added to the honour and sanctity of a place of worship, if it were loftier, and more expensively built, than common dwell-

[a] *Vide* Appendix, Note (A.)

[b] Castles and towers might be higher, provided the more elevated parts were not used for either religious or domestic purposes.

ings: it may have arisen from the desire to assimilate the synagogue to the Temple, the Temple having been built upon an eminence.[c]

Synagogues were frequently built outside the city, that they might be near some river or sepulchre. In some instances, the Jews may have been obliged to build them without the walls: hated and disliked by the Gentiles, they may have found a difficulty in procuring a site within the city; but it is probable that in most cases, they selected the suburbs from choice. A site outside the city would be much more suitable, removed from all bustle and annoyance, and thus better adapted for religious exercises; pure water, too, being necessary to the due performance of Jewish worship, would be a reason for building the synagogue near to a river. St. Luke makes mention of a synagogue built near the river side;[d] and Juvenal, speaking of one

Sometimes outside the city, near a river.

[c] There is a prophecy in Isaiah respecting the Temple: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it," chap. ii. 2. So anxious were the Jews in the time of Maccabæus that this prophecy should be literally fulfilled, that they cut down a portion of Mount Acra that it might not be higher than the Temple. (*Josephus's Jewish War*, book vi. chap. 5.)

[d] Acts. xvi. 13. De Dieu, in his note on this passage, says that the Jews built their synagogues at the water-side, after

outside the walls of Rome, informs us, that it was in a locality that abounded with water.[e]

Sometimes near a sepulchre.

Synagogues were sometimes built near the sepulchres of devout persons;[f] sometimes they were built round sepulchres, so as to enclose them within their walls. Synagogues thus circumstanced, were esteemed more sacred. There was a notion amongst the Jews, that the souls of the deceased hovered round the tombs in which their bodies were deposited, and that by their intercession, suppliants, who frequented their tombs, obtained the more easily their requests from God;[g] and though some Jews strongly

the example of Isaac, who meditated by the well Lahai-roi, (Gen. xxiv. 62.) It is, however, more likely that in this, as well as in many other practices, they followed the example set them by the heathen.

[e] "Substitit ad veteres arcus, madidamque Capenam;
Hîc ubi nocturnæ Numa constituebat amicæ.
Nunc sacri fontis nemus, et delubra locantur
Judæis." *Sat.* iii. 11.

[f] Benjamin of Toledo, in his Itinerary, speaks of a splendid synagogue at the tomb of the prophet Ezekiel, (supposed to have been built by Jechonias, assisted by the 35,000 Jews who followed him after his liberation by Evil Merodach.) This synagogue was looked upon as a sanctuary, and persons of the highest rank and from the most remote places resorted thither for prayer. It was on the bank of the Euphrates.

[g] It is to this superstition that the prophet Isaiah in all probability refers, when he accuses the Jews of "remaining among the graves and lodging in the monuments," ch. lxv. 4. But it may be objected, Did not the Jews consider sepulchres as unclean? Were not graves carefully marked out lest any

disclaim this notion, and assert, that they frequent these tombs to learn a lesson of humility, and to be put in mind of death, (the common lot of all;) still there is little doubt, but that the general opinion was in favour of the intercession of departed spirits. Some of their writers have even gone so far as to explain, how the prayer of the suppliant on earth reaches the departed spirit; and it is expressly stated in the Gemara, that the reason why the Lord hid the body of Moses was, "lest the Israelites in exile should come to his tomb, and pray, saying, O Moses, our master, intercede for us, we beseech thee."

Frequently without a roof.

The synagogue, like the Temple, was frequently without a roof. This, coupled with the fact, that the Jews had no images in their places of worship, and that when praying, they lifted

one should touch them? Why, then, build a synagogue in close connexion with what they considered impure? We answer, they carefully avoided the pollution; it being enacted that no person should either read, or pray, or carry phylacteries, but at a distance from the tomb, of at least four cubits. That the feelings of the Jews were in favour of building their synagogues near to the tombs, appears from the New Testament; there they are represented as "building the tombs of the prophets, and garnishing the sepulchres of the righteous," Matt. xxiii. 29: and in the Cippi Hebraici, it is related, that at the feast of Purim, they were accustomed to go to the tomb of Mordecai, singing psalms and thanksgivings, with cymbals and dances.

up their eyes to heaven, may have given rise to the Satirist's accusation :—

> " They adore nothing but the clouds, and the divinity of heaven." [h]

Synagogues had in general round them, plantations of trees; a circumstance rather extraordinary, when we consider the prohibition in the book of Deuteronomy.[i]

Should be built wherever there were ten men of full age and free condition.

There were several canons relating to the building of a synagogue, but on none was more stress laid, than on that which enacts, " That a synagogue shall be built in every place, where there are ten men of full age, and free condition." The reason of the selection of this number is not very evident; like the number *seven*, it is used in Scripture, to denote an indefinite number.[k] The first instance on record of an assembly of ten men, is to be found in the book of Ruth;[l]

[h] " Nil præter nubes, et cœli numen adorant."

Juvenal, Sat. xiv. 98.

Another thing may have given rise to the accusation. The Jews, after they had intercourse with the Greeks and Romans, were accustomed to call Jehovah by the name *Heaven*, (*vide* Daniel iv. 25; Matt. iii. 2, xxi. 25.) Their well-known habit of swearing by the heavens (Matt. v. 34) may also have countenanced the opinion.

[i] Chap. xvi. 21 :—

> " Omnis enim populo mercedem pendere jussa est
> Arbor; et ejectis mendicat sylva Camœnis."
>
> *Juvenal, Sat.* iii. 15.

[k] Lev. xxvi. 26; Amos vi. 9.

[l] Chap. iv. 2.

where Boaz taking upon himself the right of kindred, calls together ten men of the elders of the city. Probably, then, the Jews adopted into their religious ordinances, the number which had long been usual in their civil customs; (a circumstance not unlikely, considering the intimate connexion between their civil and religious affairs;) or, probably, they fixed upon the number because it was absolutely necessary to the due performance of the synagogal service.[m]

The dedication of a synagogue.

Two things were necessary to the proper dedication of a synagogue;—1st. The building should have been either erected for the purpose, or after its erection, should at once have been set apart by proper authority. 2dly. Prayer should be offered up in it, as a building designed for public worship. (The person offering up the prayer, might be even a chance traveller.) When these two conditions were fulfilled, the building was esteemed sacred, and enjoyed all the privileges of a synagogue.

It was unlawful to pull down a synagogue, even to make room for another; lest, in the

[m] *Vide* Jenning's Antiquities, book ii. chap. 2. There should be ten present at an excommunication; ten should follow a corpse to the grave; ten at least should be present at the celebration of the Passover. (*Josephus's Jewish War*, book vii. chap. 17.

mean time, some affliction might prevent the building of the new one. Josephus informs us, that the same feeling influenced the Jews, when Herod proposed to rebuild the Temple.[n]

There were frequently many synagogues in one city.

There were frequently many synagogues in the same city, as for instance, in Alexandria,[o] in Damascus.[p] The Talmudists assert that there were four hundred and eighty in Jerusalem; but whether this were so or not, it is evident from the Acts of the Apostles,[q] that they were many in number; we read, "how certain of the synagogue, which is called the Synagogue of the Libertines,[r] and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia, and of Asia arose, disputing with Stephen." These synagogues (or, strictly speaking, schools, as appears from their disputing) were founded at Jerusalem, at the expense of Jews living in distant countries, who sent their sons to these schools, to be instructed in the language, and traditions of the Fathers.

Synagogues sometimes in private houses.

Sometimes part of a private house was used as a synagogue, sometimes an entire house was hired for the purpose; this was generally the case in strange lands, where the Jews were but few in number, and not wealthy enough to

[n] Josephus, Antiq. book xiv. chap. 14.
[o] Philo, Leg. ad Caium, p. 783. [p] Acts ix. 2.
[q] Acts vi. 9. [r] Vide Appendix, Note (B.)

build a synagogue. The primitive Christians followed in this instance, the example set them by the Jews. We learn from the Epistles of the Apostle Paul,[s] that they met in houses; and though some commentators suppose, that by the expression *Church in a house,* (which occurs in many passages) is to be understood, a numerous family converted to Christianity, it is certainly much more in accordance with the meaning usually attached to the word Church (ECCLESIA), to suppose that congregations of Christians were accustomed to assemble at these respective houses. But whatever be the true meaning of these passages, it is abundantly evident, that the primitive Christians did at first assemble in private houses;[t]—they broke bread in private houses; they taught and preached in private houses. There were from the very first, many converts, and from the nature of things, many congregations; as yet, there was no public place of worship; they were therefore constrained to meet in the private residences of members of the Church.

Private places for prayer.

The places set apart by the Jews for private prayer, were usually rooms in the upper part of their houses, with the windows looking toward the Temple. These rooms are mentioned in both the New and Old Testament. Thus, the

[s] Rom. xvi. 3, 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philemon 2.

[t] Acts ii. 46; v. 42.

room in which our Lord celebrated the last supper, is called by St. Luke "an upper room."[u] The Apostle Paul preached at Troas, in the third story;[x] the room is called, in the 8th verse, "an upper room." When the Apostle Peter retired to pray, it was to the house top,[y] (it is very likely that in the house of Simon the tanner, a poor man, there was not the accommodation of a private chamber.) After the ascension of our Lord, the disciples met in "an upper room."[z]

These upper rooms are also mentioned in the Old Testament. When Elijah was with the woman of Zarephta, he abode in an upper room.[a] When Elisha dwelt with the woman of Shunem, (who was a rich woman,) she built for him a little chamber on the wall, and placed therein a bed, a table, a stool, and a candlestick; to this room the Prophet retired for prayer.[b] When Darius had forbidden all prayer and supplication to God, for the space of thirty days, Daniel, notwithstanding the king's decree, "ascended into his chamber,[c] and his windows being

[u] Ἀνώγεον, Luke xxii. 12.
[x] Acts xx. 9; in 8th verse, ὑπερῷον.
[y] Acts x. 9. [z] Acts i. 13.
[a] Rendered by the Septuagint ὑπερῷον, 1 Kings xvii. 19.
[b] Also rendered ὑπερῷον, 2 Kings iv. 33.
[c] ὑπερῷον, Dan. vi. 10.

open toward Jerusalem, prayed to his God as heretofore."

Their windows opened toward Jerusalem.

The windows of these upper rooms opened toward Jerusalem. The Jews considered the prayer of Solomon, at the dedication of the Temple, to be an injunction to this effect: "If thy people . . . . shall pray unto the Lord *toward the city which thou hast chosen, and toward the house which I have builded for thy name;* then hear Thou in Heaven their prayer and their supplication, and maintain their cause."[d] The Jews then turned, in prayer, to Jerusalem, because there was the Temple, there the ark of the covenant, there the mercy-seat,[e] where Jehovah promised to meet his people. If, however, they were unable at any time to discover the exact direction in which the Temple lay, a canon enjoined to pray to the Father, *who is in heaven.* Hence, doubtless, the first words of the Lord's prayer; Our Blessed Lord, wishing that his people should look to their God as no longer manifesting his glory in one particular place, but as dwelling in heaven, and there, through himself, ready to hear their prayers, commands them to pray, saying, "Our Father, which art in heaven."

[d] 1 Kings viii. 44, 45.

[e] There are several allusions in the New Testament to the mercy-seat (ἱλαστήριον) as a type of the propitiation which is in Christ Jesus. *Vide* Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2; Rev. xi. 19.

CHAPTER III.

The Schools.

Jewish schools of two kinds.

THE schools of the Jews were of two kinds, public and private; the former connected with the synagogue; the latter, the property of some doctor licensed to teach the law.

The public schools.

The public schools were invariably in the same building with the synagogue; and in places not very populous, the same room answered for the twofold purpose of divine worship, and of scholastic instruction.

The councils.

In times of prosperity, the Jews had not only their schools, but also their councils, which, distinct in purpose and form, were held in a different place. When the nation was subjected to the Romans, the authority of the councils ceased. They, however, kept up in the schools, the shadow and semblance of these ancient tribunals; "not so much for the sake of government as for instruction."[a] Hence the presiding doctor of the synagogue was

[a] Selden de Syned. lib. ii. cap. iv. sec. 10.

called not only Head of the School, but also, Father of the Council.[b]

Formation of schools.

The presiding doctor had the exclusive right to teach, and in general exercised his right; sometimes, however, he gave to those doctors who were his colleagues, as also to candidate doctors, and even to students, permission to teach and declare their opinions; sometimes he licensed a doctor to open a new school. The great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, was the parent of all these schools; they appointed from their body presiding doctors to new schools; and from schools thus constituted, others of minor importance derived their origin.

Customs of the schools.

The following customs were observed in the schools. The doctors and students *sat* within a railing; the presiding doctor in an elevated chair, the disciples at his feet. Those who came for the purpose of hearing the arguments *stood* without the railing.[c] We meet with several allusions to this custom in the sacred narrative. Our Lord is found by his parents *sitting* in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions.[d] St. Paul informs us

[b] When the Jews had jurisdiction in civil matters, the presiding doctor of the school was also the president of the council.

Maimonides, Talmud Thora, cap. iv. sec. 3.

[d] Luke ii. 46.

that he was brought up *at the feet* of Gamaliel;[e] Mary *sat* at the feet of Jesus, and heard his words;[f] and in the celebrated prophecy of Jacob, it is predicted, that "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from *between his feet*, till Shiloh come."[g]

Mode of teaching in the schools.

The mode of teaching in the schools is thus described by Maimonides:[h]—"If any preceptor be willing to teach his disciples without an interpreter, he may do so; but if he use an interpreter, the interpreter must stand between the doctor and the pupils. The doctor, in the Hebrew tongue, declares his opinion to the interpreter, who explains it in the vulgar tongue to all the pupils; in such a case, all communication between doctor and pupils, must be through the interpreter, who can neither add to, nor take away from, the words of the doctor, nor make the slightest change, except he be his preceptor or parent."

Reverence paid to the schools.

Though very great reverence was paid to the synagogue, it yielded in sanctity to the school; and hence, though a city abounded with synagogues, a doctor would not pray except in the school. To this day it is usual for both master and pupils to celebrate in the school the daily worship of the synagogue. For the same

[e] Acts xxii. 3.
[f] Luke x. 39.
[g] Gen. xlix. 10.
[h] Talmud Thora, cap. iv. sec. 5.

reason, though a room might be used as a school from having been a synagogue, the contrary was not permitted; it being a maxim with the doctors, that the sanctity of a place could not be diminished.

Mention of schools in the times of the kings.

There is mention of schools as far back as the times of the kings. In these times, whenever there arose amongst the people, a prophet, who by the holiness of his life, the efficacy of his doctrine, the frequency of his miracles, or the truth of his prophecies, proved incontestibly his divine mission; he in general opened a school, in which he instructed a number of disciples; and on certain occasions, such as new moons, sabbath-days, &c., admitted any persons whatever, who wished to be instructed in the word of the Lord. On the death of the prophet, some one of his disciples, either specially selected by the Spirit, or eminent for his great learning, succeeded him in the school; or else (as sometimes happened) many of his disciples opened schools, and became themselves masters.

Schools of the prophets sometimes in cities, sometimes on mountains, sometimes in the wilderness.

The history of Elisha, gives nearly all the information that is to be obtained, with respect to the schools of the prophets. They were sometimes in cities, sometimes in deserts, sometimes on the tops of mountains. Thus we read that Elisha stopped for a short time at Jericho,[1] went

[1] 2 Kings ii. 18.

from thence to Bethel, thence to Mount Carmel, where he evidently resided for a time.[k] We read how the sons of the prophets complained to Elisha, that their place of residence was too strait for them; they said to him, "Let us go, we pray thee, unto Jordan, and take thence every man a beam, and let us make a place there, where we may dwell. And he answered, Go ye."[l] Here is an instance of a school in the wilderness.

The sons of the prophets.

The disciples in these schools were called, "the Sons of the Prophets;"[m] they lived with the prophet, were accustomed to take their food in his presence,[n] and sat at his feet to receive instruction.[o]

The prophets sometimes appointed one of their pupils as their successor, who, upon being appointed, became at once the prophet's constant companion and minister. Thus, when Elisha was ordained by Elijah, to the prophetic office, "he arose, and went after Elijah, and ministered unto him;"[p] in the Second Book of Kings, he is said to be the person "who poured water upon the hands of Elijah."[q] When Elisha succeeded

[k] 2 Kings iv. 25.
[l] 2 Kings vi. 1.
[m] 2 Kings ii. 3, 5.
[n] 2 Kings iv. 41, &c. and v. 22.
[o] 2 Kings iv. 38; vi. 2; where to dwell is literally to sit.
[p] 1 Kings xix. 21.
[q] 2 Kings iii. 11.

to the prophetic office, he chose Gehazi as his servant.[r]

The prophets instructed, not only their disciples, but any persons who sought their counsel. This appears from a passage in the Book of Ezekiel, where the Lord, speaking to the prophet of the conduct of Israel, says; "They come unto thee as the people cometh, and *they sit before thee* as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them."[s] And that there were stated times for consulting the prophet, appears from the answer of the husband of the Shunammitish woman. The woman in her grief is most anxious to consult Elisha, and says to her husband; "Send me, I pray thee, one of the young men, and one of the asses, that I may run to the man of God, and come again."[t] The husband answers; "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day; *it is neither new moon nor sabbath?*"

Origin of schools of the prophets.

The schools of the prophets most probably had their origin in the time of Samuel; when,

[r] 2 Kings iv. 12. Jerome, in one of his epistles (Ad Rusticum de Formâ Vivendi), says, that the sons of the prophets are the monks of the Old Testament, and that Elijah was the chief of monks. He seems, however, to have overlooked the fact, that though Elijah and Elisha were both of them unmarried, the sons of the prophets were not obliged to celibacy. See 2 Kings iv. 1.

[s] Chap. xxx. 31. *Vide* also chaps. viii. 1; xiii. 24; xiv. 4.

[t] 2 Kings iv. 22, 23.

after a long period of irreligion and moral darkness, "the Lord appeared again in Shiloh." We read, indeed, in the Book of Judges, that the children of Israel came up to Deborah the prophetess, for judgment; but the first mention, of a company of prophets, is in the First Book of Samuel. "After that; (saith the prophet to Saul) thou shalt come to the hill of God, where is the garrison of the Philistines; and it shall come to pass, when thou art come thither to the city, that thou shalt meet *a company of prophets* coming down from the high place."[u] When David fled from the anger of Saul, he too met with *a company of prophets*, at Naioth, in Ramah.[x]

Prophecy not always a prediction of the future.

We must not, however, suppose that these prophets were, in every instance, persons who foretold the future. The Hebrew word *nabhi*, which is translated prophet, merely signifies *an eloquent discusser*. And, indeed, the attentive reader of the Scriptures will easily perceive; that prophecy cannot always mean a prediction of the future; nor a prophet, one who foretels things to come. Thus Miriam, the sister of Aaron, is called a prophetess;[y] because she was

[u] 1 Sam. x. 5.

[x] 1 Sam. xix. 18. This school, then, was on a mountain, (as was also that mentioned in the 10th chapter); Ramah, as its name imports, being a lofty place.

[y] Exod. xv. 20.

divinely inspired to sing praises to the Lord. The company of prophets that met Saul, "came down from a high place, with a psaltery, and tabret, and pipe, and harp, before them, and did prophesy;"[z] *i.e.* influenced by the Spirit, they sang praises to the Lord, accompanied by the instruments of music. But further, not even is the influence of the Spirit necessary, to constitute a prophet, as the word is sometimes used in Scripture. We read that David and his captains separated certain persons to prophesy; that these persons prophesied, according to the order of the king; and that their prophecy consisted, in rendering to the Lord praise and thanksgiving.[a] In like manner the Apostle Paul calls Epimenides, the Cretan poet, a prophet;[b] because he composed verses in praise of his gods.

The schools of the prophets were thus the precursors of the later synagogal schools. Of these prophets; some were influenced by the Spirit to sing Jehovah's praise, and to celebrate his wonderful works; to some was given a knowledge of the future, and to predict things to come; but, generally speaking, the prophets[c]

[z] 1 Sam. x. 5.

[a] 1 Chron. xxv. 1, 2, 3.

[b] Titus i. 12.

[c] Three different words are rendered by the English word prophet, viz. *roch*, *chozeh*, and *nabhi*; they are all to be found

were merely the philosophers of the Jews, who devoted their time, to the cultivation of heavenly wisdom.

in 1 Chron. xxix. 29. Abraham is the first person called a prophet (*nabhi*), Gen. xx. 7.

CHAPTER IV.

The Origin of the Synagogue.

The antiquity of the synagogue is a point universally admitted. "Moses *of old time* hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath-day."[a] The question is, when was it first founded? Some date its institution from the time of Moses; some make it later; whilst others deny its existence, till after the Babylonish Captivity. Synagogue very ancient.

That there was public worship before the Deluge, appears from a passage in the Book of Genesis;[b] where the inspired writer, speaking of Public worship before the Deluge.

[a] Acts xv. 21.

[b] Gen. iv. 26. This passage is rendered in the margin, "Then men began to call themselves by the name of the Lord;" and this rendering seems to be supported by Gen. vi. 2, where the worshippers of Jehovah are called *the sons of God*. But this makes no difference in our position. Men would not call themselves by the name of the Lord, if they did not call upon his name; and the very title given to them of sons of God; is in itself a proof, that they were distinct, in their worship and habits, from those that are styled *the sons of men*. Woodward, in his Essays, supposes the sons of God to have been angels.

the times of Enos, says; "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." The meaning of the passage is, that in the time of Enos, men for the first time assembled together for public worship.[c] The phrase, "call upon the name of the Lord," has evidently this force in the book of the prophet Zephaniah: "Then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent."[d]

Worship in the times of the patriarchs.

When we come to the times of the patriarchs, we find that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,[e] called upon the name of the Lord; *i.e.* publicly acknowledged him in worship.[f] The patriarch Jacob even set apart a place for worship,[g] and gave it the expressive appellation of God's house (*Bethel*):[h] but yet, as in these times, the knowledge of God was confined to one family, their worship, though public, must in a great measure have partaken of the domestic character; we must therefore look to later times, for the institution of the synagogue.

[c] Joel ii. 32; Rom. x. 13.

[d] Chap. iii. 9.

[e] *Vide* Appendix, Note (C.)

[f] Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4; xxi. 33; xxvi. 25.

[g] Gen. xxviii. 22.

[h] Because there Jehovah manifested his presence. The patriarchs were accustomed to revisit, for the sake of sacrifice and worship, those places where the Lord had appeared unto them. Such places then partook of the nature of the temple rather than of the synagogue.

Jewish writers[i] universally ascribe to Moses, the origin of the custom, of reading the law on the sabbath-day. Josephus thus expresses his opinion on the subject: "Our lawgiver permitted the people to leave off their other employments, and to assemble together for the hearing of the law, and learning it exactly; and this, not once, or twice, or oftener, but every week."[k] It will be worth while to consider, how far this position is supported by Scripture.

Jewish writers derive the synagogue from the times of Moses.

It is most likely that the opinion was founded upon those passages, in which there is mention of an holy convocation on the sabbath-day. The first of these occurs in Leviticus,[l] and is as follows: "Six days shall work be done: but the seventh day is a sabbath of rest, *an holy convocation;* ye shall do no work therein: it is the sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings." The words in the original (*mikra kodesh*), are rendered by the Septuagint, *holy convocation*;[m] and from

Holy convocation of the sabbath not the origin of the synagogue.

[i] They deduce the custom of reading the law on week-days from Exod. xv. 22: "They went for three days in the wilderness, and found no water." The water (they say) signifies the law. (Isaiah lv. 1.) Lest, then, the people should be three days without hearing the law, services were instituted during the week. The second and fifth days were selected, because on the former, Moses ascended; and on the latter, descended from Mount Sinai.

[k] Against Apion, book ii. sec. 18.

[l] Chap. xxiii. 3. [m] κλητὴ ἁγία.

hence, several commentators have concluded; that, in obedience to this command, the Jews assembled every sabbath for public worship, at the door of the Tabernacle. If, however, we carefully investigate the force of the Hebrew word *mikra;* we shall find that there is no ground for concluding, from this and similar passages, that the Jews were either commanded, or accustomed, to meet together for public worship. The words translated *holy convocation,* should rather have been rendered *a proclamation of holiness;*[n] *i.e.* the day shall be proclaimed holy.[o] The word *mikra* is literally *a proclamation;* its root *kara* signifies to proclaim; and is thus rendered by our translators in several passages.[p] We cannot therefore fairly argue from the above phrase, that the Jews were accustomed to hold a convocation on the sabbath-day: so far was this from being the case; that we meet with an express command, that no man shall go out of his place on the seventh day.[q]

[n] The Vulgate gives the correct rendering, vocabitur sanctus.

[o] Viz. by the sound of the trumpet, as was the sabbath-day.

[p] Exod. xxxii. 5; Lev. xxv. 10; xxiii. 21; Jer. xxxvi. 9; Joel ii. 15.

[q] Exod. xvi. 29. No doubt this command had reference to the gathering of the manna; but as the observance of the sabbath was prior to the giving of the manna; it is rather extraordinary, (if the Jews were accustomed to meet on the

Some Jewish writers think that they see a type of the synagogue, (or rather of the schools,) in the tabernacle built by Moses, called the Tabernacle of the Congregation.[r] They style it, the Tabernacle of *the house of instruction;* because (as they say) the Israelites repaired thither for instruction in doctrine. But it does not appear that this tabernacle was set apart for prayer, which is necessary to constitute its likeness to a synagogue; nor is it recorded, that the Israelites assembled there for instruction, which would constitute its likeness to a school. It was called the Tabernacle of the Congregation; or, more literally, *the Tabernacle of Meeting* (*Ohel Mohedh*); for the same reason as was afterwards the tabernacle, properly so called, (which was not as yet built); not because the children of Israel assembled there; but because Jehovah had declared, "*There will I meet you,* to speak there unto thee; and there I will *meet* with the children of Israel."[s] To this tabernacle, or tent, built by Moses, *far off from the camp;* Moses repaired *by himself,* to meet Jehovah for instruction; and every one who sought the Lord; (not so much in prayer as to consult him in peculiar difficulties)

Tabernacle of the Congregation no foundation for the synagogue.

sabbath), that the command should be given in such general language, without any reference to the holy convocation. *Vide* Appendix, Note (D.)

[r] Exod. xxxiii. 7, &c. [s] Exod. xxix. 42, 43.

went out *alone;* "unto the tabernacle of the congregation, which was without the camp."[t]

Israelites should worship only where Jehovah placed his name.

Another passage in Exodus is brought forward to prove; that in the time of Moses, the children of Israel met together, at stated times, and in stated places, for prayer, and to hear God's word. "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee."[u] This text is understood by some, to be a general exhortation to public worship, without any reference to place; and to mean, "wherever I am worshipped, I will meet you and bless you."[x] The Latin Vulgate understands it, "In every place where the memory of my name shall be, I will come to thee, and bless thee." If, however, we compare this passage with another in the Book of Deuteronomy,[y] it will appear quite evident that, instead of there being a permission given, to worship in any place; the text quoted is, on the contrary, a restriction of worship to one particular place; viz. that in which Jehovah should record his name, *i. e.* give a visible sign of his presence and glory: and further, by attentively examining the Old Testament, we shall find, that this restriction of worship to one particular place, was enforced, both before and after the

[t] Exod. xxxiii. 7. [u] Exod. xx. 24.
[x] Spencer de Leg. Heb. lib. ii. cap. 5.
[y] Chap. xii. 13, 14.

times of Moses. Thus, when the Lord appeared to Abraham, the patriarch built an altar in the place where the Lord appeared unto him ;[z] sometime after, he pitched his tent in the same place, and there called upon the name of the Lord.[a] The Lord appeared to Jacob at Bethel ;[b] and when Jacob rose up early in the morning, " he took the stone that he had put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it," and made a vow, " *that the stone, which he had set up, should be God's house ;*" *i. e.* that there he would sacrifice, and pray unto the Lord. Some time after, the Lord reminded Jacob of his vow,[c] and commanded him to repair to Bethel ; Jacob obeyed the command, when the Lord again appeared to him, and gave him the promise of a numerous seed, and of the land of Canaan. One instance more, and it is a remarkable one: when the Lord visited Jerusalem with a pestilence, he appeared (by his angel) to David, at the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite.[d] David purchased the threshing floor, built an altar there, offered sacrifice ; when the Lord answered by fire ; thus giving a visible manifestation of his presence, putting his name there. This very threshing - floor was the site of Solomon's

[z] Gen. xii. 7.
[a] Gen. xiii. 4.
[b] Gen. xxviii. 16.
[c] Gen. xxxv. 1—7.
[d] 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, &c.

Temple.[e] These instances fully explain the meaning of the passage in Exodus above cited.

Public worship not enjoined nor provided for in the books of Moses.

We have examined the arguments adduced for the existence of the synagogue in the time of Moses, and have seen that they fail; and, indeed, there are many things, that might lead us to suppose that they would fail,—that there could be nothing similar to the synagogue in this period. 1st. In the entire five books of Moses, there is not one precept, not one injunction, in reference to prayer. There are instances of individuals offering up prayer; there are forms of prayer and thanksgiving; but there is not any one express command, enjoining public prayer. 2d. We have, recorded, the institution of the priestly office; the separation of the Levites for divine purposes; and yet the duties of the priests are altogether confined to the tabernacle: and the Levites;[f] (instead of being distributed amongst the people, and located in the different cities and villages, for the purpose of ministering in the various congregations) are ordered to dwell by themselves in forty-eight cities; the cities of the other tribes, being in many instances, far distant from any city of the Levites. Their duties, too, have all reference to the tabernacle, the priests, the sacrifices; without as much as an incidental

[e] 1 Chron. xxi. 26.

[f] *Vide* Appendix, Note (E.)

mention of duties similar to those, to be fulfilled in the synagogue. 3d. The children of Israel are commanded to hear the law read to them, once every seven years.[g] Now, is not this a presumptive argument against the existence of the synagogue, either in the time, or even in the intention of Moses? If there was the weekly reading of the law; where the necessity for reading it, once in every seven years, at the feast of tabernacles?[h]

No proof of existence of the synagogue in the times of the Judges.

A passage from the Book of Judges is referred to as proving, that in the times of the judges, there was a worship distinct from that of the tabernacle, and in all probability corresponding to that of the synagogue: it is where "the children of Israel are said to have gathered together, as one man, unto the Lord in Mizpeh."[i] It is concluded, that as the tabernacle was at this time at Shiloh; the meeting, at Mizpeh, must have been for a worship quite different from that of the tabernacle. But if we attentively examine

[g] Deut. xxxi. 11, 12.

[h] One custom of the synagogue evidently had its origin from the above command; viz. the custom of commencing the book of the law, at the feast of tabernacles.

[i] Judges xx. 1. David Kimchi assigns as the reason for the Israelites meeting at Mizpeh, the fact, of Joshua having erected an altar there, to commemorate his greatest victory. (Joshua xi. 3.) But the Mizpeh in the Book of Joshua is quite a different place, from that mentioned in the Book of Judges.

the various passages,[k] in which the Israelites are said to have met at Mizpeh; we shall find that this meeting was for deliberation, and not for worship; and that Shiloh was the place for prayer, and for offering sacrifice unto the Lord.

Meaning of the phrase, "before the Lord."

But it may be asked; How can the children of Israel be said to have gathered together, *unto the Lord;* if it were not for a religious purpose? In answer to this objection, it will be sufficient to remark, that sometimes in Scripture, a thing is said to have been done *unto the Lord,* or *before the Lord,* when it was done openly and publicly. Thus a league is made at Hebron, between David and the Elders of Israel, before the Lord,[l] *i. e.* publicly; the children of Israel made Saul king, *before the Lord,* in Gilgal:[m] or to give an instance where there cannot be the slightest doubt as to the meaning of the phrase; Nimrod is said to have been a mighty hunter before the Lord;[n] the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah were sinners before the Lord,[o] *i. e.* notorious public transgressors. The people of Israel then assembled *unto the Lord, i. e.* publicly; at Mizpeh; it was a publicly convened assembly;

[k] Judges xi. 11. 1 Sam. vii. 5; x. 17, &c.

[l] 2 Sam. v. 3. [m] 1 Sam. xi. 15. [n] Gen. x. 9.

[o] Gen. xiii. 13. Similarly Moses is said (in the Acts of the Apostles) to have been "*fair to God,*" *i. e.* exceeding fair, vii. 20.

and as they met for deliberation, and not for worship; we cannot fairly deduce from the passage under consideration, the existence of the synagogue in those days.

The synagogue did not exist in the times of the kings, as appears,

We come now to the kings. We have strong proofs that there were not in their times stated places of prayer; and probably there cannot be a stronger one than the silence of Scripture. We have the history of this period in the Books of Samuel, of Kings, and of Chronicles; we have also the writings of David, of Solomon, and of the Prophets. We have, recorded in these books, the various occurrences which befel the Jewish people, as also many of their religious customs; and yet there is no mention of a synagogue, no reference to it; but on the contrary, many things to lead us to the supposition, that in these times it was not in existence. And,

1. From the Lamentations of Jeremiah;

1. There is, in one of the books of these times, (viz. the Lamentations of Jeremiah) a melancholy picture of the miserable and desolate condition of the Jews, in their captivity. The inspired writer laments the devastation of Judæa, the overthrow of the nation, the destruction and profanation of the Temple; but there is no mention of the uprooting of the synagogue, no expression of grief, that the people were now deprived of their weekly worship, and precluded from hearing the law. The burden of the

prophet's lamentation is, that "the adversary hath spread out his hands upon all her pleasant things; for she hath seen that the heathen entered into her sanctuary, whom thou didst command that they should not enter into thy congregation."[p] And again; "He hath violently taken away his tabernacle, as if it were a garden; he hath destroyed his places of assembly (literally, the place of his assembly, *i. e.* the temple); the Lord hath caused the solemn feasts and sabbaths to be forgotten in Zion..... The Lord hath cast off his altar, he hath abhorred his sanctuary."[q] How account for the prophet's silence respecting the synagogue, but by its non-existence?

2. From the observance of fasts in the Temple;

2. Public fasts were observed by the Jews before the Babylonish captivity, and observed invariably in the Temple. Thus, in the fifth year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, a fast was proclaimed "to all the people in Jerusalem, and to all the people that came from the cities of Judah unto Jerusalem. Then read Baruch in the book the words of Jeremiah, *in the house of the Lord*..... at the entry of the new gate of the Lord's house, in the ears of the people."[r] Jehoshaphat, too, proclaimed a fast, and "Judah gathered themselves together, to ask help of the Lord: even out of all the cities of Judah they came to seek

[p] Lam. i. 10. [q] Lam. ii. 6, 7. [r] Jer. xxxvi. 9, 10.

the Lord. And Jehoshaphat stood in the congregation of Judah and Jerusalem, *in the house of the Lord.*"[s] When the prophet Joel exhorts the people to keep a solemn fast, it is the Temple that is mentioned as the place of its observance. "Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land, *into the house of the Lord your God.*"[t] Now, a fast could be observed in the synagogue as well as in the Temple. The very fact, then, that the Jews in every instance came up to Jerusalem to keep the fasts, is a presumption against the existence of synagogues in those days.

3. From the time of Rehoboam the people of Israel lived in the grossest idolatry; they rivalled the idolatrous Canaanites, in their groves and high places.[u] Pious kings endeavoured to stem the torrent of iniquity, but their endeavours were in a great measure unavailing. Now, such a state of things is quite inconsistent with a weekly reading of the law, and a weekly worship in the synagogue.

3. From the prevailing idolatry of those times;

4. Jehoshaphat, in the third year of his reign, "sent to his princes ..... to teach in the cities of Judah, and with them he sent Levites, even Shemaiah, &c. ..... and with them Elishama

4. From the mission of Jehoshaphat;

[s] 2 Chron. xx. 3, 4, 5. [t] Joel i. 14.

[u] 2 Chron. xxiv. 6, 7. 1 Kings xiv. 23; xv. 14; xxii. 43. 2 Kings xxiii. 19.

and Jehoram, priests; and they taught in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people."[x] It appears from the circumstances of the history, that this was an unusual act. The pious king saw that his subjects were ignorant of the law of the Lord, and took steps to instruct them: for this purpose he sent priests and Levites, who brought the book of the law with them. Now, if there were synagogues in existence at this time, whence this deplorable ignorance? whence the necessity for such a mission? whence the necessity of carrying about a copy of the law, if (as we must suppose) there was a copy in every synagogue? This mission of Jehoshaphat, then, is an unanswerable argument against the existence of the synagogue in his days.

5. From the wonder and fear of Josiah at finding the book of the law;

5. The pious and good king Josiah had ordered the Temple to be repaired: while the work was in progress, the book of the law was found by Hilkiah, the high priest, and read by Shaphan, the scribe, before the king. "And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his clothes; and the king commanded Hilkiah the priest, &c. . . . . go ye, inquire of the Lord for me,

[x] 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 8, 9.

and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found."[y] "And the king sent, and they gathered unto him all the elders of Judah and of Jerusalem, and the king went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the priests, and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great; and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant, which was found in the house of the Lord."[z] Now, from this history it appears that the law was a sealed book, not only to the people, but also to the priests; else why such wonder at finding the book of the law? Whence the terror of king Josiah, when he heard it read? Why the inquiring of the Lord concerning the words of the book? Why the gathering together of the people to hear it read? These things can only be accounted for, by supposing, that before the finding of this book, there was an utter ignorance of the law, its precepts, and its sanctions; and, that the sudden hearing of Jehovah's commands and denunciations filled both king and people, with alarm and fear. Some commentators are of opinion, that it was a copy written by Moses himself, that was found by Hilkiah; but then, we are not told that the

[y] 2 Kings xxii. 11, &c.

[z] 2 Kings xxiii. 1, 2.

king and the priests were struck with any fear and reverence on account of the antiquity of the copy: the contents of the volume caused all the alarm. Other commentators suppose, that Hilkiah discovered the volume, lying opened in the place where the Lord pronounces a curse against his people if they forsake him.[a] But this is mere supposition. How reconcile it with the exclamation of Hilkiah, "I have found the book of the law?" The most natural solution is, that there was great ignorance of the law, a scarcity—in fact, a dearth of copies,[b] and thus several things enjoined in the law fell into disuse; the sabbath was disregarded, the passover neglected.[c] Now, such ignorance of the law, such wonder, such sudden terror at its precepts and denunciations, such neglect, could not have been, had the synagogue existed in these days.

6. From the duties assigned to the Levites.

6. We brought forward as an argument against the existence of the synagogue in the time of Moses, the fact, that the duties assigned by him to the Levites, had all of them reference to the tabernacle. The same argument holds good in the present instance. We have, recorded,[d] the duties assigned to the Levites in the reign of

[a] Deut. xxviii. 36.

[b] This is not to be wondered at, considering the impiety of the two preceding reigns.

[c] 2 Kings xxiii. 21, &c. [d] 1 Chron. xxiii. 24.

Solomon, and they all refer to the Temple, the sacrifices, &c., without the slightest allusion to the synagogue.

Objection from a passage in the Psalms.

There is a passage in the Psalms, in which (according to the Authorized Version) express mention is made of the synagogue; it occurs in the 74th Psalm, and 8th verse: "They have burnt up all the synagogues of God in the land." Now, as this Psalm depicts the miserable state of the Jewish people in their captivity, if the Authorized Version be correct, this passage alone is an answer to all our arguments. But, on looking to the original, we shall find that the words rendered *synagogues of God,* signify literally, *the places of meeting God,* (*i. e.* the places where Jehovah promised to meet his people,) and thus, strictly speaking, are applicable only to the Temple. The Hebrew noun being in the plural number does not interfere with this interpretation; for two plural nouns are used to designate the Temple in this very Psalm, and one of them the noun under consideration.

Synagogue dates its origin from the times of Ezra;

We must look, then, for the origin of the synagogue, to the times subsequent to the Babylonish captivity;[e] and, upon examining the records

[e] Jewish writers, anxious as they are to establish the antiquity of the synagogue, are obliged to confess as much; for they are forced to acknowledge, that most of its forms and customs have been derived from Ezra. Thus they ascribe to

of these times, we shall find a perfect model of the synagogue, any thing like which we in vain seek for, in the history of earlier periods. In the Book of Nehemiah,[f] we meet with the following statement: "And all the people gathered themselves together as one man, into the street that was before the water-gate; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe, to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation, both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the street that was before the water-gate, from the morning until mid-day, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law. And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose; and beside him stood Mattithiah, &c. . . . . on his right hand; and on his left hand, Pedaiah, &c. . . . . And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people, (for he was above all the people,) and when he opened it, all the people stood up; and Ezra blessed the Lord the great

him the introduction of verses, points, and accents; of forms, and stated times of prayer.

[f] Neh. viii. 1, 2, 3, &c.

God; and all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands; and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the Lord with their faces to the ground. Also Jeshua . . . . and the Levites caused the people to understand the law; and the people stood in their place. So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." We have in these verses a perfect model of the synagogue. 1st. The pulpit of wood, elevated above the people. 2d. The reading of the law by Ezra and the other doctors.[g] 3d. The explanation of the law. 4th. Praise and thanksgiving. 5th. The people answering, Amen.

There are many circumstances which prove, that after the Babylonish captivity there was a revival of religion amongst the Jews; and therefore justify us, in looking to this period, for the origin of the synagogue. And,

As appears, 1. from the number of copies of the Scriptures in these times;

1. The number of copies of the Sacred Scriptures. Before the captivity there was a great scarcity,—so much so, that the discovery of a copy was the cause of wonder and fear; but after this chastisement, the word of God was valued, and copies became numerous. Hence we meet with frequent mention of the Scriptures in the Books of the Maccabees: "The books of

[g] Neh. ix. 3, 4.

the law which they found they burnt with fire;"[h] and again, Jonathan says, in his letter to the Lacedæmonians, "We have the holy books of Scripture in our hands to comfort us."[i]

2. From the number of scribes;

2. The number of scribes. The scribes were men who devoted much time to the study of the law. Thus Ezra is said to have been "a scribe skilled in the law of Moses."[k] That there were many such after the captivity, appears from a passage in the First Book of Maccabees, where we are informed, that there "assembled unto Alcimus and Bacchides *a company of scribes,* to require justice."[l]

3. From the public reading of the law.

3. The public reading of the law. Two instances of this occur in the Book of Nehemiah; in the first instance, the reading was continued during the whole feast of tabernacles;[m] the second instance occurs in the thirteenth chapter, where we are informed, that they again "read in the book of Moses, in the audience of the people." Whether from the very first the law was read every sabbath-day, does not appear from the inspired records; it is more probable, that at the first, the law was read only during the festivals, when the whole nation was assembled at Jerusalem.

[h] 1 Macc. i. 56. [i] 1 Macc. xii. 9. [k] Ezra vii. 6.
[l] Chap. vii. 12. [m] Neh. viii. 18.

First synagogues were in Gentile countries.

These considerations lead us to date the origin of the synagogue from the time of Ezra. Certainly the first account we have of the reading of the law in public, is in the passage from Nehemiah quoted above; upon this occasion, the law was read in the public street. Now, many of the Jews did not return after the captivity, but continued to live amongst the heathen; of course, then, they could not openly fulfil the duties of religion, and were of necessity compelled to hear the law, in private houses. Hence it is likely, that the first synagogues were built in heathen countries; in time their number and magnificence increased, so "that it was not easy to find a place in the habitable globe, in which there was not a synagogue."[n]

[n] Josephus, Antiq. book xiv. chap. 12. See also his Jewish War, book vii. chap. 21.

CHAPTER V.

The Furniture of the Synagogue.

Principal articles of furniture four in number.

THE principal articles of furniture in a synagogue were four in number. 1. The Ark, or chest, in which the book of the law was kept. 2. The Pulpit, from which the law was read. 3. The Seats, for the accommodation of the congregation; and 4. the Lamps, by which the synagogue was lighted.

The ark.

1. The Ark, or chest, in which the book of the law was kept. The ark was placed at the end of the synagogue which looked toward Jerusalem, and was, as nearly as possible, a facsimile of the sacred ark in the Temple. As in the Temple, none of the inspired records were admitted inside the ark, but the Ten Commandments engraved on the two tables of stone; so in the synagogue, the books of Moses alone were admitted inside the ark,—the other sacred volumes were altogether excluded: and as the worshipper, entering the Temple, bowed in reverence toward the holy of holies, and to the

ark therein, on which rested the cloud of glory; so the worshipper, on entering the synagogue, bowed towards the ark, looking upon it as the emblem of that ark, on which rested the symbol of the Divine presence.

2. The Pulpit. In front of the ark, there was a platform capable of containing many persons; and on this platform a pulpit or desk, from which the law was read and sermons preached. The book of the law was placed upon this pulpit; the reader stood behind, and on either side the interpreters.[a] The pulpit.

3. The Seats. The order of sitting is thus described by Maimonides:[b] "The elders sit with their backs to the ark, facing the people; the people with their faces towards the ark."[c] The seats of the elders were sometimes most costly.[d] In the synagogue of Alexandria they were of gold, covered with the richest gems; the cost of each being twenty-five myriads of golden denarii.[e] The people sat according to their The seats.

[a] Neh. viii. 7. [b] Hilcoth Tephila, cap. xi. sec. 1.

[c] This order of sitting is not always observed in modern synagogues. In a German synagogue, Vitringa remarked that the seats for the people did not face the ark, but ran parallel to the sides of the building.

[d] Our Lord alludes to these seats, when he accuses the Pharisees of loving the chief seats in the synagogue. Matt. xxiii. 6.

[e] Talmud Hieros in Gem. cap. i.

rank;[f] for instance, those of the same trade sat together. The women were separated from the men; they sat in a kind of gallery, screened with lattice-work, so that they could hear and see without being seen.

The lamps.

4. The Lamps. These were lighted not only in the evening, but also by day; probably in imitation of the lights of the Temple. It was considered a most honourable thing, for an individual to light up a synagogue at his own expense. The greatest care was observed in the lighting; the oil and candles were to be of the best description, and free from all profanation. The most superstitious respect was paid to these lights; it was illegal, for instance, to light a private lamp or candle from a light in the synagogue.

Lights burned in private houses.

On sabbath and festival days, lights were burned not only in the synagogues, but also in

[f] It appears from the Epistle General of St. James, that the primitive Christians introduced this custom into their places of worship; and the Apostle strongly censures it:—"If there come unto your assembly (literally *synagogue*) a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor man, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool: are ye not, then, partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?"—Chap. ii. 2—4.

private houses. Persius alludes to this custom in his Fifth Satire:—

"But Herod's feast returns! How changed thou art!
Now superstition lords it o'er thy heart.
Now lamps, with violets decked, in rows depend;
And from each window greasy clouds ascend.
Now the red dish within its circling rim
Beholds the tail of some poor tunny swim.
Now the white earthen vessel swells with wine,
And thou in folly stand'st prepared to join.
Strictly observant of the *curtailed race*,
Lo! thee, with anguish brooding on thy face;
Pale turns thy cheek with idle empty frights,
While thy lips move, and mutter Jewish rites."[g]

The Jews considered this burning of lights in their private dwellings to be a most important duty; they would beg from door to door, that it might not be neglected. Their women had in general the management of the lamps; and it was

[g] "Herodis venêre dies, unctâque fenestrâ
Dispositæ pinguem nebulam vomuere lucernæ,
Portantes violas; rubrumque amplexa catinum
Cauda natat thynni; tumet alba fidelia vino;
Labra moves tacitus, recutitaque sabbata palles."
Line 180, &c.

The *Dies Herodis* mean the festival days of the Jews in general; so called because Herod Agrippa was the best known of the Jewish nation to the Romans. It appears from the above passage that some Romans had been infected with this Jewish superstition, and hence Seneca says deridingly, in one of his epistles, "We would prevent this burning of lights on the sabbath-days, since neither do the gods want light, nor are men pleased with smoke."—Epistle 95.

superstitiously supposed to be a reason for their dying in childbearing, "that they had not been attentive in burning the sabbath lights."

The most remarkable exhibition of this kind, was at the feast of the dedication of the Temple, hence called by Josephus,[h] φῶτα (*i. e.* lights). During this feast, they lighted lamps at the doors of their houses; in acknowledgment of the mercy of that God; who had restored to the Temple its candlestick, and to his people their worship.

Minor articles of furniture.

The minor[i] articles of furniture in the synagogue were likewise four in number. 1. The Sacred Volume. 2. The Trumpets. 3. The Vail. 4. The Alms' chest.

The Sacred Volume.

1. The Sacred Volume, containing the five books of Moses. It consisted of a number of skins sewed together; the first and last being each fastened to a roller of wood. In writing a copy of the law for the use of the synagogue, the greatest care was necessary, the least omission or redundance causing the rejection of the manuscript. Their caution, in fact, amounted to superstition. There should be a certain space between the lines, a certain space between the letters, a certain number of letters in each line,

[h] Antiquities, book xii. chap. 11.

[i] *i. e.* esteemed as such by the Jewish rabbies. It is remarkable that the Sacred Volume should be in the list.

a certain number of lines in each column; the very parchment, upon which it should be written, was most scrupulously described. Maimonides mentions twenty conditions, any one of which not being observed, caused the rejection of the manuscript.[k] We may trace, however, in this excessive caution, the finger of Providence: for these conditions, being always fulfilled to the letter, afford the strongest possible proof; that the inspired volume has come down to us unimpaired, though passing through the hands of a people, who made it void by their traditions.

As great care was taken of the sacred volume, so great honour was paid to it. It was preserved in a linen covering, studded with gold or silver ornaments. The congregation was expected to remain, till it was replaced in the ark: or if, (as sometimes happened) the synagogue had no safe depository for it, none could leave the synagogue till it had been first carried out; and then the entire congregation should accompany it to its place.[l] And finally, when it had become worn by frequent use; it was placed in an earthen vessel, and buried in the sepulchre of some renowned doctor.

Great reverence paid to it.

2. The Trumpets. Of these there were two

The trumpets of two kinds.

[k] Hilcoth Tephil, chap. x. sec. 1.

[l] This, however, was not strictly enforced, unless the synagogue had but one door.

kinds; the *Shopheroth*, or Cornets, and the *Chatseroth*, or Trumpets properly so called. Both are mentioned in the 98th Psalm, "With trumpets and sound of a cornet, make a joyful noise before the Lord the King."[m] The Cornet was curved, (originally a ram's horn); the Trumpet was straight, (made of metal, generally silver).[n] They were each used for a twofold purpose; the Cornet, at excommunication, and to proclaim the new year; the Trumpet, at the fasts, and to announce the approach of the Sabbath.

Cornets used at excommunication;

1. At Excommunication. This was, strictly speaking, a punishment of the synagogue; and hence excommunicated persons were called *Aposunagogoi, i.e.* put out of the synagogue;[o] because the punishment consisted in expulsion from the synagogue, and not from the Temple.[p] It was inflicted by order of the council; but that the punishment might be the more severe by being more public, the sentence of the council was proclaimed with the sound of the Cornet, to the congregation assembled in the synagogue.

To proclaim the new year.

2. To Proclaim the New Year. On the first day of every year, *i.e.* on the first day of the month Tisri,[q] the Cornets were sounded in all

[m] Verse 6. [n] Numb. x. 2.

[o] ἀποσυνάγωγοι, John ix. 22; xii. 42.

[p] *Vide* Jenning's Jewish Antiquities, book ii. chap. iii.

[q] Viz., the seventh civil month.

the congregations of the children of Israel, whether in the land of Canaan or not. The Jews considered this blowing of the Cornet to be commanded in the Book of Numbers;[r] "And in the seventh month, on the first day of the month, ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work: it is a day of blowing the trumpets (*cornets*) unto you."[s] It was necessary that every individual should hear the sound, but he need not be in the synagogue, provided he heard with attention. The custom is observed to this very day. If the first day of the new year happen to be a Sabbath day; out of respect to the Sabbath, no blowing of Cornets is permitted.

The Trumpets also were used for a twofold purpose:—

1. At the Fasts. In the Book of Numbers the children of Israel are commanded; "If ye go to war in your land against the enemy that oppresseth you, then ye shall blow an alarm with the Trumpets; and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies."[t] Hence they concluded, that whenever any affliction pressed upon their

Trumpets (properly so called) used at the fasts;

[r] Chap. xxix. 1.

[s] In the Temple two trumpets were joined to the Cornet; but the sound of the Cornet should predominate.

[t] Chap. x. 9.

church, they should blow the Trumpet before the Lord.[u]

To proclaim the sabbath.

2. To Announce the approach of the Sabbath. For this purpose the Trumpet sounded six times, a certain preparation being to be made after each sounding.

The Vail.

3. The Vail was a conspicuous ornament in every synagogue. It hung before the recess in which the ark was placed; no doubt in imitation of the vail of the Temple.

The Alms' chests.

4. The Alms' chests were placed, sometimes within the synagogue, but generally at the door. The alms received, were appropriated to two different purposes; part to the relief of the poor brethren residing in the land of Judæa, the rest to the relief of the poor members of the congregation.

Tablets in synagogues.

In some synagogues there were Tablets, on which were inscribed the names of benefactors, as also of those, who had been excommunicated or denounced for any crime.

Libraries attached to synagogues.

Libraries were frequently attached to synagogues. The celebrated synagogue of Ezekiel had one most copiously furnished. Married persons anxious for children, were accustomed to dedicate their books, in order that they might be blessed with an offspring.[x]

[u] *Vide* Joel ii. 15.

[x] Benjamin Tudelensis Itiner. 79.

CHAPTER VI.

The Government of the Synagogue.

In early ages, the Regal and Judicial offices seem to have been generally vested in the same person. This union of offices was sanctioned by Moses;[a] it was adopted by the Israelites, "Make us a king *to judge us,* like all the nations;"[b] it was common amongst the Gentiles.[c] In the latter times of the Jewish commonwealth, this union still continued; thus the members of the Jewish council are styled by Josephus,[d] not only (*archen*) the magistracy or executive, but also (*kritas*) the judges.

In early ages regal and judicial offices united.

Every Jewish city of any repute had its council, which sat in the chief synagogue of the city; and as in the Jewish polity, church and state were not only intimately united, but were, in fact, identical; this council had supreme

Every Jewish city of repute had its council of presbyters or elders.

[a] Deut. xxi. 6, 19, 21; xxii. 15, 16, 18; xxv. 7, 8.

[b] 1 Sam. viii. 5, 6.

[c] Livy, lib. i. cap. 26, raptus in jus ad regem.

[d] Antiq. book iv. chap. 8.

authority in all matters, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Each council had its President or Patriarch. Its members were styled *Presbyters,* or Elders.

This appears from the history of Susannah;

That such was the nature of the Jewish councils, and such the names given to their members, appears from many sources. We will cite, in the first place, as the most ancient testimony, the Apocryphal Book of Susannah. In this book we read of *two Elders,* (presbyteri,) who were wont to meet at the house of Joacim, *to judge* the people.[e] Though the history is fabulous, still it is likely, that it was composed so as to be conformable to the customs of the times, in which it was written.

From Philo;

Our next testimony will be from Philo. He, (in his Life of Moses,) commenting on the judgment passed upon the sabbath breaker,[f] who gathered sticks upon the sabbath-day, says; "They brought him *before the President, with whom the priests sat in council;*"[g] an evident allusion to the customs of the synagogue in his time.

From Josephus;

Josephus, in his Jewish War,[h] speaking of the strife at Cæsaræa between the Jews and Syrians, says; "The *Elders* (presbyteri) of the Jews were unable to restrain their own people;" and in the

[e] Verses 5, 6. [f] Numb. xv. 32, 33.
[g] Life of Moses, book iii. page 528. [h] Book ii. chap. 12.

account given by him of this sedition, no other rulers are mentioned, but these Elders. In the fourteenth chapter of the same book, when narrating another tumult that occurred at Cæsaræa, he speaks of the Rulers of the Jews, and these twelve in number. In another book, making mention of one Antiochus, he says, "that he was a man of repute amongst the people, because his father was the Chief (*archon*) of the Jews at Antioch."[i] And to give one instance more, (one which proves the union of the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction in the same individuals): one Jesus, *the Ruler of Tiberias*, is represented "as ordering the multitude to depart from the synagogue, and permitting the *Senate* alone to remain."[k] This last passage is conclusive as to the form of synagogal government: there is in it mention of a *President* and *Senate*, and also strong evidence, that the President of the synagogue was also the Chief magistrate of the city; for he is styled the Ruler (*archon*) of Tiberias.

From Maimonides;

Maimonides, in his treatise on fasting, sets before us the same form of government. Whenever there is a fast for rain, "the ark is brought out into the street; the assembled people cover themselves with sackcloth, and scatter ashes on the ark, and on the book of the law: then one

[i] Book vii. chap. 21. [k] Life of Josephus.

of the congregation takes some of the ashes, and sprinkles them on the head of the *President.* The ark is then placed in the midst; and, all sitting down, some Rabbi of *the Elders* stands up to read, &c."[l] This quotation from Maimonides exhibits the form of government above described; viz. a council, consisting of members called *Elders,* and a *President,* the head of this council.

From Benjamin of Toledo.

But there is no where such express mention of the form of government of the synagogue, as in the writings of Benjamin of Toledo. Speaking of the Jews at Damascus, he says; "There is in this place *the Chief of the Senate,* whose name is R. Ezra, and his brother Sarschalom, the father of the house of judgment, and R. Joseph, holding the fifth place in the senate, and R. Massach, the speaker, and R. Meir, the glory of wise men, and R. Joseph, a stone to be admired, the pillar of the assembly,[m] and R. Heman, the pastor, and R. Tsaddick, the physician."[n] *This Senate with its Chief* (he informs us) managed all matters at Damascus, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Again, speaking of the Jews at Constantinople,[o] he tells us, that there was in that city, a *Senate* consisting of

[l] Hilcoth Taanith, cap. iv. sec. 1.

[m] "Who seemed to be pillars," Gal. ii. 9.

[n] Itiner. page 56. [o] Ibid. p. 28.

five persons, and one of them R. Eliakim, the Pastor. Speaking of the Jews at Marseilles, he says, "After three days, I came to Marseilles, in which city there are many illustrious and learned men; there are two churches on the sea shore, one in the plain, the other on the hill. The illustrious men of the city constitute *the great Council.* R. Simeon, the son of R. Antolius, R. Jacob, his brother, and R. Levan, preside over the higher college; and R. Jacob Phirpienus, R. Abraham, &c., over the lower."[p] These testimonies abundantly prove, that wheresoever the Jews were in any number, they appointed a council, under the control of which, all civil and religious affairs were managed.

Synagogue sometimes governed by one rabbi.

If the Jews in any place were but few in number, the entire management of the synagogue was entrusted to one Rabbi. Thus Benjamin, speaking of a city in Egypt, says; "There is a synagogue without the city, and one Elder, who is a Rabbi, acts as *Pastor* and *Minister* of the synagogue."[q] Buxtorf, in his Jewish Synagogue, bears testimony to the same.[r] "Where there are about ten Jewish families, they endeavour to procure some Rabbi, to instruct their children, to advise them in divine things, to read prayers, and to perform the other offices of religion.

[p] Ibid. p. 8. [q] Ibid. p. 119. [r] Chap. xlvi.

This Rabbi has the power of ordaining;[s] he declares the meaning of the law, administers justice, celebrates marriages, grants divorces; in a word, he has vested in him the authority of an entire presbytery."

Government of modern synagogues.

In modern synagogues, as in general, there cannot be collected a sufficient number of Rabbies to form a council; they have, besides the presiding Rabbi, a lay senate, called *Parnasim*,[t] whose authority and office is in some respects similar to that of the presbytery. They have supreme power, (as far as is permitted by the laws of the people amongst whom they live,) in all things beyond the walls of the synagogue. It is their business, to see that the synagogue and its furniture is in good repair; they impose tribute for sacred and civil purposes; inflict punishment on the refractory; support and redeem the captives of their nation; and plead the cause of their citizens before Gentile magistrates: in a word, the Parnasim have now the privileges and the powers of the ancient councils; there being however this difference, that they are the most wealthy, and not, as of old, the most learned members of the body; and that they hold their office for but one year, being

[s] *Vide* Appendix, Note (F.)

[t] Maimonides calls them Elders. They were somewhat analogous to our churchwardens.

annually chosen by the free voice of the people.

We shall find, that as far as there is mention, in the New Testament, of the government of the synagogue, it confirms the account above given. We have evidence that there were many rulers in the one synagogue (of course forming a council): thus the Evangelist Luke, speaking of St. Paul and his companions, says; "They came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the sabbath-day, and sat down; and after the reading of the law and the prophets, *the Rulers of the synagogue* sent unto them,"[u] &c.; these Rulers, as far as we can judge from the context, equal in rank, dignity, and office; and constituting, most probably, the presbytery of the synagogue of Antioch. In another chapter,[x] the same Evangelist mentions by name two of the rulers of the synagogue at Corinth, viz. Crispus and Sosthenes. The Evangelist Mark informs us, that Jairus *was one of the rulers of the synagogue* at Capernaum.[y] The New Testament, then, confirms our view of the government of the synagogue; and though we meet with passages in which but the one Ruler is mentioned,[z] still this does not subvert our position; the government of the synagogue being sometimes confided to one Rabbi.

New Testament confirms this account of the government of the synagogue.

[u] Acts xiii. 14, 15.
[x] Acts xviii. 8, 17.
[y] Chap. v. 22.
[z] Luke xiii. 14. John iii. 1.

CHAPTER VII.

The Discipline of the Synagogue.

Punishments of the synagogue of two kinds.

THE Punishments of the synagogue were of two kinds: the *Anathema,* or Excommunication; and the *Perinœa, i. e.* the Censure, or Corporal infliction.[a]

Excommunication.

Excommunication was the heaviest punishment of the synagogue, and when inflicted in its most severe form, debarred the offender from all intercourse with his countrymen; they could neither eat nor drink with him; they could not so much as be under the same roof with him; a hut was therefore built for the wretched being, thus avoided by all, in which he dragged out his existence, far from human society.

Manner of excommunicating.

The manner of excommunicating was as follows:[b] there was first the rebuke, which continued for seven days; after this the offender's name, and his offence, were proclaimed publicly in the synagogue for the space of thirty days,[c]

[a] Justinian Novel, 146. [b] Jore Dea, sec. i.

[c] Probably on the sabbaths occurring during this period.

during which time, the offender was looked upon as excommunicated, and should keep at a distance of four cubits from each of his brethren. If, at the expiration of the thirty days, he asked pardon of those whom he had offended, and gave signs of sincere repentance, he was again admitted to communion with the Church; but if he continued contumacious, did not repent of his crime, nor submit to those who had excommunicated him, the excommunication was continued for thirty days more.[d] If, after the expiration of this period, there were no symptoms of a change of mind, the excommunication was extended to another thirty days;[e] and then, if there was no reconciliation, the anathema was pronounced, the offender was completely cut off from the Church, and visited with its heaviest chastisement.[f]

[d] A longer or shorter time might be prescribed by those in authority.

[e] Maimonides is of opinion that this latter period is not at all necessary.

[f] The Jews considered themselves bound by their law, to admonish and reprove an offending brother. Thus in the Jewish precepts of R. Levi Barzelonita, we read; "It is commanded to reprove an Israelite who does not walk correctly, ... as it is written, (Lev. xix. 17;) 'Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him.' But it is asked in the Siphra; Whence do you hold, that if you chide him four or five times, and he does not repent, that you are bound to reprove him again? because the Scripture says;

Excommunicated person excluded from the synagogue.

The Excommunicated person, though permitted to enter the Temple through the gate called the gate of mourning, was rigorously excluded from the Synagogue. "When they excommunicate any individual, they proclaim it publicly; after which, it is not lawful for any Jew to speak to the excommunicated person, or to come nearer to him than four cubits. He is cast out of the synagogue; he is obliged to sit on the ground, with his feet naked, as if some relative were dead, until absolved by one or more of the Rabbies."[g] Hence we find, in the writings of the New Testament, the phrase, "to cast out of the synagogue," used to express excommunication.[h] Since the overthrow of the Jewish nation, excommunication is inflicted with the greatest severity. It is mentioned in a book, falsely ascribed to Athanasius;[i] "That a Jew, in whose dwelling an image of Christ was found, having been insulted and tortured in various

Rebuking thou shalt rebuke him. Whence our Master says in the Gemara; Rebuking, thou shalt rebuke him, even an hundred times. The first rebuke should be in private, with a soft tongue and soothing words, that he may not be put to shame; but if this bring him not to a sense of his sin, they publicly confound the sinner, holding up his crime to public notice, till he return to the right path." Præcept. 218, p. 321. Ed. Hottingerus.

[g] Leo de Modena de Consuet. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 3.

[h] John ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 2; ix. 34.

[i] De Passione Imaginis Domini Nostri.

ways, was cast half dead out of the synagogue."

Power of excommunicating rested with the council.

In the ancient synagogue, the power of excommunicating rested with the council;[k] in modern synagogues, the Presiding Rabbi and the Parnasim exercise this power. The punishment was considered severe, in proportion to the dignity of the court that passed the sentence. Thus it was considered a less punishment to be excommunicated by a council of three, than by one that consisted of a greater number of members: excommunication by a strange synagogue was a lighter punishment than that by one's own; whilst the most severe of all, was that inflicted by the great Sanhedrim. "He who is excommunicated by his own city, is considered to be excommunicated by every other city; but he who is excommunicated by another, is not therefore excommunicated by his own; but he who is excommunicated by the Sanhedrim, is excommunicated by all Israel."[l]

Allusion to excommunication in the New Testament.

There is evident allusion to excommunication as a Jewish punishment in the New Testament. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother: but if he will not hear thee, then

[k] Maimonides Hilcoth. Talmud Tora, cap. 6 & 7.

[l] Jore Dea, sec. 20, 21.

take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."[m] We have in this passage, first, the private rebuke, and then, the public proclamation to the church.

Excommunication had its origin during the captivity.

In the Old Testament, there is no mention of excommunication till we come to the days of Ezra: but when we come to his times, we meet with a proclamation, that all the children of the captivity should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem; and "that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and elders, all his substance should be forfeited, and himself *separated* from the congregation of those that had been carried away."[n] Hence it is likely, that the punishment had its origin in the time of the Babylonish captivity; and, in fact, the nature of the case would lead us to suppose this; for when they were in captivity, obliged to yield obedience to the laws of an heathen state: what other punishment could they inflict, or at least carry out to its full intention, but that of excommunication? It came, then, to be inflicted chiefly when they were

[m] Matt. xviii. 15—17.

[n] Ezra x. 8.

in exile, and more especially when in subjection to the Romans; the Roman emperors not allowing any of the acts or sentences of the synagogue, to interfere with their edicts.[o]

Corporal punishment in the synagogue.

The other punishment inflicted in the synagogue, was the Perinaa, *i.e.* the pecuniary or corporal. The former does not appear to be at all authorized by Scripture; of the latter there is frequent mention in the writings of the New Testament. "Beware of men, (saith our Lord to his disciples,) for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues."[p] "Behold, I send unto you (speaking to the Jews) prophets, and wise men, and scribes, and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city."[q] "Lord, they know (saith the Apostle Paul, speaking of his cruel acts towards the early Christians) that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee."[r] "Punishing them through all the synagogues, I compelled them to blaspheme."[s] Flagellation, then, was a punishment often resorted to in the synagogue.

Flagellation voluntarily suffered.

Flagellation was sometimes voluntarily suffered

[o] Constitut. Arcadii et Honorii in Cod. Theod. lib. ii. tit. i. leg. 10.

[p] Matt. x. 17.

[q] Matt. xxiii. 34.

[r] Acts xxii. 19.

[s] Acts xxvi. 11.

as an expiation for sin; "thus the German Jews are wont to be flagellated in the synagogue, on the evening of the day of expiation, as a token of their repentance."[t] But, generally speaking, it was inflicted as a punishment, and considered a lighter one than excommunication.

A rabbi seldom excommunicated.

The Jewish authorities were at all times unwilling to have recourse to the severity of excommunication, especially in the case of a Rabbi or Doctor. "An Elder, or the Father of the council, though he may act perversely, is never publicly excommunicated, unless he commit some such sin as Jeroboam, the son of Nebat; but when he has committed any offence, they flagellate him privately. They treat in a similar way a student, unless he be a disgrace to his companions, or the name of God be profaned by him; in which case they excommunicate him."[u]

Flagellation inflicted by order and in presence of the council.

Flagellation was inflicted by order, and in presence, of the council. Thus the apostles were brought before the council, who "beat them, and commanded them that they should not speak in the name of Jesus."[x] Thirty-nine stripes were given, in obedience to the Law which commanded that the stripes should not

[t] Orach Chaium, sec. 607.

[u] Hilcoth Niddui Vaccher, cap. cxxxiv. sec. 42.

[x] Acts v. 40.

exceed forty, and that the criminal should be beaten before his judge.[y] The scourge had three lashes; the criminal was therefore struck thirteen times, and between each stroke they were accustomed to recite the following words:—"If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD: then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues and of long continuance, and sore sickness, and of long continuance."[z]

Why our Lord was never excommunicated.

Before closing this chapter, we will notice a question that is not unfrequently proposed, viz. why is it that we never read of our Lord having been excommunicated? He was hated by many of the Jews; the Priests and Rabbies were bitterly opposed to him; he had certainly subjected himself to the punishment, for he had been guilty of at least one offence, which was visited with excommunication; namely, "if any one should slight even one head of doctrine, which is written in the prescripts of the scribes."[a] Now, our Lord had been often guilty of a breach of this canon, even in the presence of the Jewish rulers; and yet he was never excommunicated. Two reasons can be assigned for

[y] Deut. xxv. 2, 3. [z] Deut. xxviii. 58, 59.
[a] Canon 5.

this; first, the extreme unwillingness of the Jewish Rulers to have recourse to this severe punishment; and secondly, the rank of our Lord. He was evidently looked upon as a Rabbi, and we have seen that a Rabbi was not to be excommunicated, but in an extreme case; for the same reason, the Apostles, though beaten and persecuted in every way, are never said to have been excommunicated. In fact, the only instance, of the punishment, recorded in the New Testament, is that of the poor blind man who was restored to sight by our Lord; and of him we read, that he was cast out of the synagogue.[b]

[b] John ix. 34.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Alms collected in the Synagogue.

THE word (*Tsedhakah*) used by the Jews to denote alms, is usually rendered *justice*, or *righteousness*. In the Hebrew version of Tobit, (a book the design of which is to commend almsgiving,) the word is invariably used to signify alms.[a] We find in the New Testament a similar use of the corresponding Greek word.[b] Thus when our Lord exhorts the multitude in his sermon on the mount; "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men;"[c] the word for alms (in the most ancient manuscripts) is that which signifies literally *righteouness*. When the Apostle Paul exhorts the Corinthians to be liberal to the poor, he quotes a passage from the Psalms:—"He hath dispersed abroad, he hath given to the poor; his righteousness [*almsgiving*] remaineth for ever."[d] And as the Greek word for righteousness is used to signify

Hebrew word signifying righteousness, used also for alms.

[a] Chap. iv. 8—11; xii. 9.
[b] δικαιοσύνη.
[c] Matt. vi. 1.
[d] Psalm cxii. 9.

almsgiving; so, *vice versâ,* the Greek word for almsgiving[e] is the rendering sometimes given by the Septuagint translators, for the word *Tsedhakah,* when taken in its literal sense. Thus; "He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness [Gr. *alms*] from the God of his salvation."[f] Again; "It shall be thy righteousness,"[g] (Gr. *alms,*) saith Moses to the people of Israel.

Reason for this application of the word.

Various are the opinions how a word, signifying *righteousness,* should come to denote *alms.* It may be, that the Jews were accustomed to look upon almsgiving, as the surest means of justification before God;[h] and that hence arose the intimate connexion between the two words; or that, looking upon their worldly goods as but held in trust, they felt that *justice* demanded that assistance should be rendered to the poor; and there are some things in confirmation of this latter opinion: the language of the Jewish beggar was; "Consider me worthy;" or, "It is just that I should receive it;" or, "Give me what is commanded." And probably in allusion

[e] ἐλεημοσύνη. [f] Psalm xxiv. 5.

[g] Deut. xxiv. 13. See Psalm xxxiii. 5; Isaiah lix. 16; Dan. iv. 27.

[h] Daniel says to king Nebuchadnezzar; "Break off thy sins by righteousness (almsgiving), and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." Chap. iv. 27.

to this feeling, our Lord calls riches uncharitably retained, "*the mammon of unrighteousness.*"[i] And, Solomon, in the Book of Proverbs, exhorts; "Withhold not good from them to whom it is *due*, [in the margin, from *the owners thereof*,] when it is in the power of thine hand to do it."[k] But whatever be the true reason, there seems to have been in the minds of ancient writers, a connexion between justice and munificence; and this not only in Sacred, but also in Classic authors: thus Cicero defines justice to be, "a habit of the mind, which, paying regard to the public welfare, gives to every one his due, and *munificently and equitably* preserves the bond of society."[l] And in one of the plays of Terence, an individual is represented as praying, that there may be an excuse for his folly in *the justice*, i. e. *the clemency* of his friend.[m]

Every Jew (the tribe of Levi excepted) had his portion of inheritance in the land of Canaan, and this portion inalienable; it might, indeed, through imprudence or negligence, pass from his hands

Relief given to the poor either compulsory or voluntary.

[i] Luke xvi. 9. [k] Chap. iii. 27.

[l] Habitus animi, communi utilitate servatâ, suum cuique tribuens, atque societatem conjunctionis humanæ, *munifice atque æque* tuens.—*De Finibus*, lib. v.

[m] Nunc hoc te obsecro,
Quanto tuus est animus natu gravior, ignoscentior;
Ut meæ stultitiæ, *in justitiâ tuâ*, sit aliquid præsidii.
Heaut. Act. iv. sc. 1, lin. 33.

for a time; but it should be restored at the year of jubilee. This restoration, however, did not prevent the existence of poverty in the intervening period; and hence laws were wisely enacted, for the relief of the poor and suffering Jews. The relief afforded was twofold; compulsory or voluntary; *i. e.* such as could not be withheld; and such as was given freely. The former was fourfold; viz. "the gleaning; what had been left through forgetfulness; that which grew in the corners; and the tenths; and with respect to these, the owner receives no thanks for the gift; the poor come and take it, even against the will of the owner; though he be the poorest man in Israel, they take it from him."[n] Voluntary relief, (*i. e.* relief, the measure of which is not determined by law, but left to the benevolence of each,) is expressly enjoined in the Book of Deuteronomy; "If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren, within any of thy gates, in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thy heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother, but thou shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need in that which he wanteth ..... thou shalt surely give him, and thine heart shall not be

[n] Maimonides de Donis Paup. sec. 7. 8.

grieved when thou givest unto him, because that for this thing the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy works, and in all that thou puttest thine hand unto: for the poor shall never cease out of the land; therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy in thy land."[o] There is a similar injunction in Leviticus.[p]

Origin of voluntary relief.

As long as the poor Israelites could take advantage of the provision made for them by law, voluntary assistance was but scantily afforded; but after the captivity, when many of them were scattered among the Gentiles, many engaged in commerce; they could not receive the relief allowed by law; hence there was an absolute necessity for voluntary contributions. These were made at first by the Jews in exile,[q] in time they became customary in the land of Canaan, and at length were enforced by law; the individual who was remiss in contributing to the necessities of the poor, being liable to be punished with stripes, by order of the magistrate or council.[r]

Alms collected in the synagogue for a twofold purpose.

The alms collected by the Jews in exile were for a twofold purpose; part was for the poor

[o] Deut. xv. 7, 10, 11.

[p] Chap. xxv. 35, 36.

[q] Esther ix. 22.

[r] Maimonides de Donis Paup. cap. vii. sec. 10.

brethren in the land of Canaan, part for the poor members of the congregation. There were two chests in every synagogue for the reception of these alms.

Origin of the custom of transmitting alms to Judæa.

The custom of transmitting alms to the land of Canaan is very ancient. Jerome makes mention of it, and uses it as a precedent for sending money to the poor Christian brethren in Judæa. "It would be tedious, [he says] were I to cite the different passages in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, in which he earnestly inculcates, the duty of sending succour to the poor brethren, living at Jerusalem, and in the Holy Land; not that they may abound, but that they may be refreshed; not that they may heap up riches, but that they may supply the wants of nature, and drive off cold and hunger. This custom has continued in the land of Judæa to this very day, not only amongst ourselves, but also amongst the Hebrews; viz. 'That they who meditate on the law of the Lord day and night, and have no portion on earth but the Lord alone, should be sustained by the ministering, of the congregations, and of the whole earth.'[s] Not that some may be eased and others burdened, but by an equality, that the abundance of some may supply the wants of others."[t] A feeling of

[s] 2 Cor. viii. 13, 14. [t] Jerome, Epist. lib. ii. fol. 45.

pity and reverence towards the land of Canaan may have given rise to this custom; or, these voluntary contributions from other lands may have been necessary, to enable the Jews living in Judæa to observe the sabbatical year: Maimonides assigns this as the origin; "Without the land of Canaan, where the sabbath of the soil is not observed, (in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Ammon and Moab, since these countries are nearest to the land of Israel); they shall separate the tenths; the first tenths, and the tenths of the poor; that the poor of Israel may be supported by these tenths, during the sabbatical year."[u] But whatever may have been the origin of the custom, the Apostle certainly conformed to it, when he collected from the Gentile churches, for the churches in the land of Judæa.[x]

Collection of alms in the synagogue.

The alms for the support of the poor members of the congregation were put into the alms' chest before prayers; and on Sabbath evenings,[y] what had been collected was apportioned to the poor for the entire week. Sometimes, after the usual collection in the Synagogue, there was an

[u] Maimonides Matternoth Aniim, cap. vi. sec. 5.

[x] Rom. xv. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, 3; 2 Cor. viii. 8, 9; Acts xi. 29; xxiv. 17.

[y] Each member on that evening merely promised so much, the Jews being unwilling to touch money on the Sabbath day.

extraordinary one made by the Chazzan, for some particular purpose. "Whenever it is necessary to exercise any extraordinary offices of charity, either towards the poor of the city, or towards a stranger travelling for some object; (as for instance, to place out a marriageable virgin, or to redeem a captive, or something similar); then the Heads of the synagogue order the Chazzan to go to each member of the congregation, and to get their names for alms, in this form; 'May the Lord bless N., who will expend so much in alms, for this or that purpose.' As this was usually done on the sabbath-day, (when the Jews do not handle money,) each person, by word of mouth, bound himself to the ministers of the synagogue for a certain sum, which he paid the following week."[z]

The Jews would not handle money on the sabbath-day.

This superstitious custom of not handling money on the sabbath, is very ancient; thus, Philo praises the Emperor Augustus, because, in his anxiety that the Jews should be partakers of his bounty, he ordered, that if the day of distribution happened to be the Jewish sabbath, it should be bestowed on the following day.[a] Some commentators illustrate, from this custom, the passage in 1st Corinthians,[b] in which the

[z] Leo de Modena, Rit. Jud. par. i. cap. 14.

[a] Lib. de Leg. ad Caium. [b] 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

Apostle advises the Christians at Corinth to set apart, on the first day of the week, whatever they intended for the relief of their poor brethren: they suppose that the Corinthians observed the Jewish sabbath, and abstained from touching money on that day; and that the Apostle, by ordering the money to be set apart on the first day of the week, thus made a distinction between the Lord's day and the sabbath.[c]

Distribution of the alms.

The distribution of the alms lay with the Council; more generally however, with the President of the synagogue.[d]

[c] Ex quibus manifestum est, cum septimo die, thesauros aut collectum facere Judæis non liceret, Paulum eodem instituto, vigente adhuc sabbatho, ordinasse Corinthiis, ut in posterum diem, qui erat primus septimanæ, collectos suos differunt, quo ipso diem illum primum, non ut festum, sed ut ἐργάσιμον, ideoque festo oppositum, et operi collectæ destinatum, consideravit. Cocceius, tom. vii. ad quæst. 83.

[d] Maimonides de Donis Paup. cap. vi. sec. 17.

CHAPTER IX.

The Presbyters of the Synagogue.

Election of the Presbyters of a synagogue.

THE Rules commonly observed in the election of Presidents of the synagogue, are handed down in the Codex Berachoth.[a] R. Isaac says; "They do not ordain a pastor over the church, without first consulting the church, as it is written, see, the Lord hath called by name Bezabel;[b] the holy and blessed God said to Moses, Moses, whether does Bezabel seem to you to be fit? Moses answered, O Lord of the world, if he seem fit to thee, must he not much more so to me? God said, nevertheless, go to the people and repeat to them the same words; he went to Israel and said, Whether does Bezabel seem to you to be fit? They answered, If he appear such to the holy and blessed God and to you, how much more so must he appear to us." The above, though altogether fiction, yet gives an insight into the mode of election of the President

[a] Fol. 55, col. 1. [b] Exod. xxxv. 30.

of the synagogue. The entire church was consulted, and the question to each member of the congregation was, whether the individual proposed seemed to him to be fit.

Choice of both president and presbyters at first with the civil governor.

It is very difficult to determine, when this mode of election first came to be adopted. As Jehovah was the king of Israel, so at the first, he exercised his authority in choosing the governors and judges of his people. Through Moses he appointed the first Jewish council;[c] through Samuel, he selected Saul to be king;[d] through the same prophet he appointed David. When the Israelites were under kings, these kings exercised all authority in both civil and religious matters, and, of course, constituted councils according to their pleasure; and not only the monarchs of their own nation, but those to whom they happened to be in subjection, assumed to themselves this power. Thus, at the time of the captivity, Artaxerxes delegated this power to Ezra;[e] when Judæa was conquered by Pompey, Gabinus, the præfect of Syria, appointed five councils throughout the land.[f] After the destruction of Jerusalem, the Emperor Titus is said to have appointed R. Jachanan, the son of Zacchæus, to be President of the council. It thus appears that, originally, the appointment of

[c] Numb. xi. 16.
[d] 1 Sam. x. 20, 21.
[e] Ezra vii. 25.
[f] Josephus, Antiq. b. xiv. c. 10.

the President and members of the councils, lay with the ruling Civil authority, whatever that might be.

Mode of election according to the Talmudists.

But, on the other hand, the Talmudists assert, that the Sanhedrim had supreme power in all religious matters; that on them all other councils depended, and that their delegates appointed the Presbyters of the different councils. Thus Maimonides says; "Our wise men have handed down to us, that delegates from the great Sanhedrim were sent throughout all the land of Israel to examine; and wherever they found a wise man, fearing to sin, and mild, they made him a councillor of the state."[g] And, again; "We know that R. Gamaliel was the President, and Chief of the great Sanhedrim; and that its institutes were received, throughout the whole land of Israel, and in all places of exile; no king, or any other individual, interfering."[h]

Solution of the discrepancy.

The apparent discrepancy can be easily solved. Though the civil rulers had the supreme power, yet, being in most cases ignorant of every thing connected with the Jewish religion, they gave to the Sanhedrim the determining of all religious controversies, and put under this control all other councils. Thus, after the restoration of the commonwealth by the Assamonæans, the authority

[g] Hilcoth Sanh. c. 11.

[h] Dioris Filius in the Kabbala concerning R. Gamaliel, fol. viii. col. 1.

of the Sanhedrim was evidently supreme, acknowledged by kings and governors; it formed the councils in the different cities of the land, and appointed the members of these councils.

The Sanhedrim, though having such powers, never exercised them absolutely, they invariably consulted the wishes of the people: even in the management of their own affairs, in the choice of their own Presidents, they sought the concurrence of the people. This appears from a comparison of two passages of Hebrew history, which treat of the election of a President; for when one history[i] gives to the council the power of electing their President, without any mention of the people being consulted;—the other,[k] relating the same event, ascribes the election altogether to the people.

The Sanhedrim consulted the wishes of the people.

In modern synagogues, if there be no Patriarch, every thing depends upon the suffrages of the people. "Even one person can prevent an election to an office, and say, I oppose N.'s being chazzan."[l] If there be a Patriarch, he has the right of nominating all the officers of the synagogue; but this right is never exercised against the wishes of the people. "The Patriarch gives to those under him the liberty of selecting their

Election of presbyters in modern synagogues.

[i] R. Abraham in Cabbala, fol. lix. col. 1.

[k] Berachoth, fol. xxvii. col. 2.

[l] Orach Chaum, cap. liii. sec. 19.

magistrate and minister; and they come to him to receive imposition of hands and license."[m]

Mode of ordination.

Presbyters were ordained by imposition of hands, a form derived, no doubt, from the ordination of Joshua by Moses.[n] The imposition of hands signified two things; a conferring of authority, and a communication of the gift of the Spirit. First, a conferring of authority. The hands were always considered to be the symbol of power;[o] and hence the laying on of hands came to signify the bestowing authority and power. Secondly, a communication of the gift of the Spirit. The Spirit is said to rest upon an individual, to overshadow him; hence, the laying on of hands, the overshadowing the head by the hands, denotes a communication of the gifts of the Spirit. And thus, in the case of Joshua, not only was authority and power given to him, (as the Lord had declared to Moses, "Thou shalt put thine *honour* upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient;")[p] but the Spirit also was communicated. "Joshua, the son of Nun, was full of *the Spirit of wisdom;* for Moses had laid his hands upon him."[q]

Ordination sometimes the mere conferring a degree.

When literature flourished amongst the Jews, ordination was sometimes a mere honour—the

[m] Benj. Tudel. Itin. p. 73. [n] Numb. xxvii. 18.
[o] 1 Pet. v. 6. [p] Numb. xxvii. 20. [q] Deut. xxxiv. 9.

conferring, as it were, a degree, rather than the setting apart to an office. The number of students so multiplied, that the Presidents of schools laid on hands to signify that the individual was fit to teach; and hence, there were ordained doctors, who neither had schools, nor were members of any council.

At the ordination of the President of a synagogue, three Presbyters, at least, should be present to lay on hands.

The President of the synagogue was of the same order as his Presbyters. It is true that great honour and respect was paid to him; that he was styled the Head of the council,—the Head of the scholastic order,—the Chief of the synagogue; and that the successive Presidents of some synagogues have been handed down by Jewish historians, just as the successive Bishops of the church have been by Eusebius. Still this does not prove a difference of orders; for, 1st, The Presbyters were invariably called the *Colleagues* of the President;[r] and, from the very institution of councils, it was intended that they should be such. "I will take of the spirit which is on thee, and I will put it on them, and they shall *bear with thee* the burden of the

The president and presbyters of the synagogue of the same order.

[r] Cabbala, R. Abraham, fol. m. 58, col. 2; also Cabbala, Dioris Filii, fol. 60, col. 1.

people."[s] 2dly, The power and authority of the President and of his Colleagues were nearly the same; in fact, the only power that the President had, distinct from that of the Presbyters, was that of ordaining; and this was yielded to him, not by right of office, but to prevent the multiplication of Presbyters. At first, every one promoted to the rank of Presbyter could himself ordain others;[t] to prevent the honour being too common, a rule was made, in the time of Hillel, that none should ordain but the President. "The wise men have given this honour to the elder Hillel; they have appointed that none be promoted, but by license of the President."[u] In every other case, the President could do nothing without his Presbyters; and in all matters of deliberation, a majority of votes decided the question.

Number of presbyters in a synagogue.

Previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, there was a certain number of Presbyters to each synagogue; in cities, seven, according to Josephus; twenty-three, according to the Talmudists; but as three were competent to decide all disputes about pecuniary matters, this was the usual number in the smaller towns. Jerusalem had, besides the Sanhedrim, two Presbyteries of twenty-three, which sat in the halls of the

[s] Numb. xi. 17.

[t] *Vide* Appendix, Note (F.)

[u] Maimonides, Hilcoth San, cap. iv. sec. 5.

Temple. Now that the Jews are in exile, very little attention is paid to the number in a Presbytery; it is greater or smaller, according to the circumstances of the place, or even according to the will of the Presbyters themselves.[x]

Salaries of the presbyters.

The Presbyters were supported, partly, by voluntary oblations, partly, by a stipend, paid them from the public treasury.[y] In modern synagogues, the Parnasim impose a tribute upon the different members of the congregation, from which they pay the salaries of the presiding Rabbi and of the Chazzan.[z]

Privileges of presbyters.

The Presbyters enjoyed certain privileges, which were extended not only to the members of councils, but to all that were ordained; to all, in fact, that had the title of Rabbi or doctor. Maimonides mentions these privileges in his treatise on the Study of the Law: "They were not required to engage in any public work, they were free from the taxes for building the walls, repairing the gates, paying the watch; they were not expected to offer gifts to the monarch,

[x] Selden de Syned. lib. ii. cap. 4, sec. 10.

[y] Hæc in Judæâ usque hodie perseverat consuetudo, non solum apud nos, sed et apud Hebræos; ut qui in lege Domini meditantur, die et nocte, et partem non habent in terrâ, nisi solum Deum; synagogarum et totius orbis foveantur ministeriis. Jerome adv. Vigilant. Translated in preceding chapter.

[z] Maimonides, Mattenoth Aricium, cap. vii. sec. 10.

nor to pay tribute."[a] All this is pithily summed up in an old apothegm of R. Nechenia, the son of Hakkana; "Whosoever takes on himself the yoke of the law, they take from him the yoke of the kingdom, and the yoke of the way of the earth;"[b] *i. e.* they free him from tribute, which is the yoke of the kingdom; and from the necessity of labouring for his bread, which is the yoke of the way of the earth. Some Presbyters, however, refused support from the church, choosing a life of poverty; and, like the Apostle Paul, procuring, by their own labour, such food and clothing as was absolutely necessary to their existence.[c]

[a] Talmud Tora, cap vi.
[b] Pirke Avoth, cap. iii. sec. 5.
[c] Maimonides, Hilcoth Mattenoth Aricium, cap. x. sec. 18.

CHAPTER X.

The Chazzans, or Deacons, of the Synagogue.

Every synagogue had its Chazzan or minister; thus our Lord, having entered a synagogue, stood up to read, and after reading "he closed the book, and gave it to the minister," *i. e.* the Chazzan.[a] Every synagogue had its chazzan.

The duties of the Chazzan were;— His duties were :—

1. To take the book of the law from the ark, to hand it to the reader, and, after the reading, to replace it in the ark.[b] 1. To take the book of the law from out of the ark.

2. To call out such persons as were selected by the President to read the law. None but the Legate of the church could stand up to read, without being called upon by the Chazzan; even the President himself should be called upon by the Chazzan, if at any time he was asked to read, either by the congregation in general, or by some distinguished member of it. 2. To call out the readers.

3. To stand by the reader and observe whether 3. To stand by the readers.

[a] ὑπηρέτῃ, Luke iv. 20. [b] Luke iv. 17, 20.

he read correctly, and to assist the incorrect reader; even if the Chazzan himself were the reader, some one should stand by him. It was an important duty of the Chazzan, to see that no inaccurate reader ascended the pulpit. It might however happen, that the only Priest or Levite present was a bad reader; in such a case, they honoured his office by permitting him to read, provided he could repeat, word by word, after the Chazzan, so as to be understood by the congregation.[c]

4. To blow the trumpet.

4. To blow the trumpet. The trumpet was blown for different purposes; (to announce the approach of the sabbath, &c.;[d]) and was always sounded by the Chazzan, except on the feast of the new year, (called also the feast of trumpets,) when the trumpets were blown by the most distinguished members of the congregation.

5. To wave the napkin.

5. To wave the *Sudarion* or napkin. This was necessary chiefly in the larger synagogues; those who were at a distance from the reader of the prayers, (who stood in a low place before the ark,) could not distinctly hear his voice; and of course were unable to know when they should answer the responses; the Chazzan, therefore, stood in the pulpit with the napkin, or linen flag, in his hand, which he waved, when it was the time for the congregation to respond.

[c] Orach Chaum, cap. cxxxix. sec. 2. [d] See Chapter V.

6. To take care of the synagogue and its furniture; to light the lamps; to uncover and cover the ark, &c. In the ancient synagogue, then, the Chazzan's was an inferior office, something analogous to our sexton's: in modern synagogues, however, it is much more honourable; the duties of the Legate of the church being assigned to the Chazzan, and the meaner duties of the latter being given to an assistant, or sub-chazzan.

6. To take care of the synagogue.

The Legate of the church *(scheliach tsibbur)* was the person that recited the prayers in the congregation: he was so called, because he was supposed to offer up the prayers in the name of all, and for all. The Hebrew word answers to the words *angel*, *apostle;* and in this sense our Lord Jesus Christ is called the *Apostle* of our profession,[e] as being the person delegated to intercede for his church, before the Father's throne.

The legate of the church.

The President of the synagogue was, *ex officio*, the Legate of the church; but he seldom acted in this capacity, except on remarkable feasts or fasts; on other occasions, some member of the congregation was selected by him to act as Legate; in general, a pupil: "The master of the synagogue appoints one of his pupils to recite the prayers in the presence of the church."[f]

The president *ex officio* the legate of the church.

In modern synagogues, as was mentioned

In modern synagogues

[e] Heb. iii. 1. [f] Colbo, cap. xiv.

the chazzan is the legate.

before, and especially in the smaller ones, the Chazzan is the Legate of the church; this union of offices arose, in all probability, from the difficulty of finding persons qualified by their learning, character, and orthodoxy, to read and pray in the congregation.

The election of chazzans.

The number of Chazzans in a synagogue was in proportion to the number of members in the congregation; larger synagogues had two, sometimes more. They were in general elected by the congregation; but if the synagogue were subject to a Patriarch, or council, they appointed the Chazzan. Thus the synagogues of Canaan, Egypt, and Babylon, formerly received their ministers from the Patriarchs and councils of these districts; whilst the synagogues of the west, viz. those of Spain, France, Poland, &c., not being under any council, elected their own ministers. When Patriarchs were abolished, the synagogues of the east enjoyed the same privilege; so that now the Chazzans are, universally, chosen by the congregation. "It is not fit, that any person who is displeasing to the church be chosen to offer sacrifices to God; and on this account, M. N. Semcha has declared, that even one person can oppose the appointment of a Chazzan, and say, that he does not consent that N. should be a Chazzan."[g] The Jews are very

[g] Karo Orach, cap. liii. ad num. 10.

jealous of the civil authorities interfering in the appointment of their ministers; it is recorded, that a prince, having placed his own cap on the head of a Chazzan just appointed, to confirm him in his new dignity, was repulsed by the Chazzan saying; "My Lord, it does not become me, to receive from you, the right of offering worship to the Creator."

Chazzans, how maintained.

The Chazzans were maintained at the public expense; the contributions toward their support being partly compulsory, partly voluntary. As it was the Chazzan that, as Legate of the church, offered up the necessary prayers in behalf of the whole congregation, (which prayers were the substitutes for the sacrifices, the expense of which should be defrayed by one half shekel from each Israelite;) so, for the performance of this necessary service, each member, whether rich or poor, should pay an equal portion to the Chazzan; but for other services; such as extraordinary prayers, the chanting of hymns; which were looked upon as an honour to the congregation and to their service, rather than as necessary, the Chazzan was paid by each individual, according to his ability. Bequests were often left to synagogues, from which the President and ministers received the whole, or a portion, of their salaries.

Chazzans of the council;

The Jewish councils had each their Chazzan; he was the lictor, or apparitor, of the Jewish tribunal; it was he that inflicted the punishment of flagellation.[h] Our Lord alludes to the Chazzan of the council in his exhortation; "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him, lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the *officer*,[i] and thou be cast into prison."

of the Temple;

The Temple had its Chazzans. It was their duty to attend the priests, to dress, undress them, &c.

of cities.

Every city had its Chazzans;[k] to them was entrusted the guarding of the city by night; in fact, the word *Chazzan* was used to denote a minister of any kind.

[h] Codex Maccoth. cap. iii. sec. 12.

[i] ὑπηρέτῃ, Matt. v. 25.

[k] Bava Metria, fol. xciii. col. 2.

CHAPTER XI.

The Discourses delivered in the Synagogue.

THAT it was usual to address the congregation in the synagogue, every sabbath-day, appears from the declaration of the Apostle, James; "Moses of old hath in every city them that *preach* him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath-day."[a] Our Lord, and his Apostles, frequently preached in the synagogue on the sabbath; a circumstance quite unaccountable, if preaching was not usual.[b] Buxtorf, in his *Jewish Synagogue*,[c] shows that the custom continues to the present day; as, indeed, must be known to every one who has visited a synagogue. We will investigate in this chapter,—1st. The nature of the discourses delivered in the synagogue: 2dly, What persons were privileged, or permitted, to address the congregation.

Preaching usual in the synagogue.

The discourses in the ancient synagogue were after this manner: there was first read a portion

Discourses in the synagogue, of what kind.

[a] Acts xv. 21. [b] Matt. iv. 23; xxvi. 55. Acts xiii. 5.
[c] Cap. xvi. page 33.

of the law, which was explained by a running commentary; so that the discourses in the ancient synagogue were not at all similar to the sermons of the present day, (though, in after times, they became so,) but were rather exegeses, and paraphrases, of what was either remarkable, or obscure, in the portion read. Thus, at the reading of the law, recorded in the Book of Nehemiah,[d] not only did the Levites read the law in the hearing of the people, but they also "gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." The Talmudists, indeed, assert, that the manner in which the Levites caused the people to understand, was, by translating the Hebrew into Chaldee, (the Jews, at this time, not understanding the Hebrew tongue;) and in this opinion they are followed by a number of commentators. But the words of Nehemiah will not bear this construction; the word translated, "to give the sense," cannot mean a mere translation. And, again, it is an opinion, more common than just, that the Jews lost all knowledge of their language during the Babylonish captivity; for it has been clearly proved by the learned Altingius,[e] that all the Jews spoke Hebrew in the time of Nehemiah, and continued to speak it, till the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the Syriac became the language of the

[d] Chap. viii. 8. [e] Dissert. Phil. de Vers. Scrip. cap. i.

nation; then, and not till then, was there a necessity for a verbal translation.

The Chaldee Paraphrases will give the most correct idea of the nature of the discourses delivered in the ancient synagogue; for, in fact, the paraphrases owe their origin to these discourses. Now, these paraphrases are not mere verbal translations; on the contrary, they remove difficulties, explain metaphorical language, expound parables, illustrate types. To give one or two instances: the prophet Isaiah, speaking of God's dealings with his vineyard, says; "And he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and made a wine-press therein; and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes."[f] The Chaldee paraphrase is; "I sanctified my people, and I honoured them; and I placed them as a plant of a choice vine; and I built my sanctuary in the midst of them; and I gave my altar, that there might be an expiation for sins; and I said that they would perform good works before me; and, lo, they were corrupt in their actions." Again: the following passage occurs in the Book of the Prophet Zechariah; "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the

The Chaldee Paraphrases give the most correct idea of their nature.

[f] Chap. v. 2.

inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness."[g] The paraphrase is; "In that time, the doctrine of the law will be opened as a fountain of water, to the house of David, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and I will remit their sins."

The discourses delivered in the synagogue highly allegorical.

The discourses delivered in the synagogue were highly allegorical. The Jewish Rabbies were very fond of allegorizing the different precepts, and histories in the Scriptures, supposing this mode of interpretation to be more consonant to the intention of the inspired writers. Thus, in the Jerusalem Talmud,[h] where mention is made of the joy which the ancient Jews manifested at the feast of tabernacles,[i] when they drew forth the waters; R. Jehosua thus comments; "R. Josua, the son of Levi, said, Why is the place called the place of drawing?—because thence they draw the Holy Spirit, as it is written, With joy shall ye draw water from the wells of salvation."[k] The Jewish Rabbies, then, when expounding this passage in Isaiah, understood by the water the Holy Spirit; and by the drawing of the water, the outpouring of the Spirit; an allegorical exposition, confirmed by our Lord himself.[l]

[g] Chap. xiii. 1.
[h] Tractatu Succa, cap. Hechalil.
[i] Vide Appendix, Note (G.)
[k] Isaiah xii. 3.
[l] John vii. 37, 38, 39.

In the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, there is an allegorical exposition, very similar to the discourses delivered in the synagogue. The Apostle having mentioned the circumstance of Abraham having had two sons, proceeds to say; "Which things are thus allegorized,[m] for these are the two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar; for this Agar is Mount Sinai, in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children; but Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." Sarah is supposed to represent that church, which lived through faith in the promises; and Agar to represent that, which at Mount Sinai was reduced to bondage. Amongst the Jews, the freedom or bondage of the mother determined that of the child; and, therefore, the Apostle (following out the allegory) pronounces the members or children of the former church to be free, those of the latter to be in bondage.

Allegorical expositions in the New Testament.

The allegorical expositions of the synagogue had much that was fabulous, mixed up with the truth; hence, in allusion to them, the Apostle Paul exhorts Timothy "to avoid profane and old wives' *fables*;"[n] and the Apostle Peter, speaking of the solid foundation of christian truth, says; "We have not followed *a cunningly-*

Discourses in the synagogue very fabulous.

[m] ἀλληγορούμενα, chap. iv. 24, 25, 26. [n] 1 Tim. iv. 7.

devised fable,"[o] such as was often to be found in the discourses delivered in the synagogue. In fact, so puerile and absurd did they at length become, that Wagenselius complains, in strong terms, of the unprofitable discourses delivered in his time:—"In their harangues, which they commonly make in the synagogues, they do not explain the articles of faith; they do not instruct the ignorant in the manners and customs of the Fathers; they do not exhort to piety and virtue, but they amuse their hearers with empty, enigmatical declamation; and the more foolish and absurd the sermon, the more it is approved of."[p]

The discourses in the synagogue sometimes in parables.

The discourses of the synagogue were sometimes in parables, a mode of instruction very usual in eastern countries, and adopted by our Lord himself. The following is one of their parables, as found in the Reschith Chochma:[q]—"The wise men of blessed memory say; Repent, whilst you have strength; whilst the lamp burns, give it oil, lest it be extinguished; if the lamp be extinguished, oil avails it nothing. Thus, it is

[o] 2 Pet. i. 16.

[p] "Proinde in concionibus suis quas vulgo in synagogis declamant, non capita fidei exponunt, non rudioribus mores et instituta majorum declarant, non verba ad pietatem et virtutem faciunt, sed auditores offuciis quibusdam ludunt et ænigmatibus, ac quo quisque ineptiorem et absurdiorem se præstat, tanto magis dicta illius probantur." — Tela Ignea Satanæ, pag. 245.

[q] Fol. iii. col. 2.

declared, that what oil is to the lamp, the law and its precepts are to man; as it is said, Let thy head lack no ointment.[r] Moreover, our doctors say in the Misdrach; The holy blessed God said to Israel, My sons, whilst the gates of repentance are open, repent; I receive the gift in this world; but when I shall sit in judgment in the next world, I will receive no gift: he who hath laboured in this life, shall eat with me in rest; this life is the porch, the next the chamber; prepare yourself, whilst in the porch, that you may enter the chamber."

Sermons preached in the synagogue.

But, besides the running commentary or paraphrase, there was frequently a discourse, (analogous to our sermon,) after the usual service of the synagogue. "If on the sabbath there be *a sermon,* they read in the Prophets, either three verses, or five, or seven, and not the usual twenty-one."[s] Their manner of preaching is described by Buxtorf:—"When a sermon is to be delivered, the whole congregation sits. The preacher covers his head, and, standing by the pulpit, begins by reading out some portion of Scripture, as his text or argument; to this he adds some saying of the Rabbies, which they call *(Mimor);* he then enlarges on his subject, bringing forward, in proof of his assertions, various passages of Scripture, and various autho-

[r] Eccles. ix. 8.

[s] Codex Sopher, cap. xii. sec. 7.

rities from the Rabbies." Sermons were first preached in the synagogue, about one hundred years before Christ.

Name given to the discourses delivered in the synagogue.

The usual name, for the discourses of the synagogue, was DARASCHOTH; the root of which signifies, "*to inquire into, to discuss,*"[t] whether in a set oration or by questions. This being the force of the Hebrew word, it will appear, that there are several allusions to these discourses, in the New Testament. Thus, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle Paul asks; "Where is the *disputer* of this dispensation?"[u] (*i. e.* the dispensation of the Old Testament.) The same Apostle admonishes Titus; "to avoid *foolish questions,*[x] and genealogies, and contentions;" alluding, no doubt, to the vain and foolish disputations in the synagogue; and in his eloquent speech before Agrippa, he speaks of his appearing with confidence before that monarch; "because he knew him to be expert in all customs and *questions*[y] which are among the Jews."

Persons privileged to preach in the synagogue.

Our next inquiry will be, What persons were privileged or permitted to address the congregation in the synagogue?

The ruler of the synagogue privileged.

And first of all, the Ruler of the synagogue had this privilege; and hence, he is defined to

[t] Answering to the Greek verb, ζητεῖν.

[u] Συζητητὴς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, chap. i. 20.

[x] Titus iii. 9. [y] Acts xxvi. 3.

be the person "who has authority to preach and to expound the law."[z] This privilege of the Ruler is nowhere so clearly exhibited, as in a circumstance narrated in the Sepher Hakkabbala;[a] "The Rabbon Gamaliel, falling under the displeasure of the elders of his college, was removed, and the Rabbi Eliezer substituted in his place; the elders afterwards became reconciled to Gamaliel, and restored him to his former dignity, but did not remove Eliezer; and thus, out of every three sabbaths, Gamaliel preached twice, whilst Eliezer preached but once." In the Gospel of St. Luke,[b] we meet with an instance of the Ruler of the synagogue addressing the congregation: our Lord had performed a miracle, and "the Ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath-day; and said unto the people; There are six days in which men ought to work, in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath-day." But it is needless to multiply proofs, upon a point conceded by all.

Could give permission to any person qualified.

The Ruler of the synagogue could also give permission, to any educated person, to stand up

[z] Glossa ad Gemaram Codicis Horaioth, cap. iii. fol. 13, col. 2.

[a] Fol. lviii. col. 2, and fol. lix. col. 1.

[b] Chap. xiii. 14.

and address the congregation. This is evident from many passages in the Acts of the Apostles, as also from Jewish writers; thus, Maimonides, speaking of the discourses delivered during the fasts, says; "If there be no elder present, they appoint some doctor to preach, who is not an elder: if there be no doctor present, they appoint some person of known character and integrity."[c] The practice of the modern synagogue is exactly similar; Wagenselius informs us, that though there are certain occasions on which the presiding Rabbi usually preaches, (such as before the Passover, the day of Expiation, &c.)—yet at other times, a stranger accidentally coming in, or any individual whatsoever, in whose learning and judgment they can confide; may be called on to preach.

[c] Taanith, chap. iv. sec. 2.

CHAPTER XII.

The Ritual of the Synagogue.

I. THE FORM OF PRAYER.

Prayers used in the synagogue of two kinds.

The Prayers used in the synagogue were of two kinds, private and public; the former, such as were used by individuals, previous to the commencement of the public service; the latter, such as could be used only in the congregation, and were read by the Legate of the church.[a]

[a] The Jews supposed a peculiar blessing to be attached to public prayer; because it is said, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty." Psalm lxxxii. 1. And, since the letters in the word GNADAH (a congregation) make up *ten*, they inferred, that a congregation should consist of this number at least. *Vide* chap. II. But from Mal. iii. 16, they inferred, that the Messiah could be present, if even two met together in his name; an opinion strikingly analogous to our Lord's declaration; "When two or three are gathered together for my name (εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, *i. e.* for my glory), there am I in the midst."

Public liturgy of the synagogue consisted principally of two formulæ.

The Public liturgy of the synagogue consisted principally of two formulæ, the *Schemah* and the *Schemon Esre.* The latter form should be recited, three times each day, by every Israelite, whether bond or free, male or female; the former by every free male, each morning and evening, in addition to the Schemon Esre.

The Schemah.

The Schemah consisted of three portions selected from the law,[b] viz. Deuteronomy, chapter nine, verses four to nine inclusive; the eleventh of Deuteronomy, from the thirteenth to the twenty-first verse inclusive; and the fifteenth of Numbers, from the thirty-seventh to the forty-first verse inclusive. The reciting of these three portions of Scripture was called the *Keriath Schemah.*[c]

Allusion to the Schemah in the Gospel of St. Luke.

There is an evident allusion to the reading of the Schemah, in the gospel of St. Luke:[d] a lawyer asks our Lord, "Master, what must I do, that I may inherit eternal life?" Our Lord replies, "What is written in the law? *how readest thou?* He, answering, said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," &c. Now, the question of our Lord, "*How readest thou?*" evidently referring to some well-known reading; the

[b] The first two of the portions, together with Exod. xiii. 1—10; and Exod. xiii. 11—16, were the portions of Scripture written on the Phylacteries.

[c] *Vide* Appendix, Note (H.)

[d] Chap. x. 26.

reciting of the Schemah being emphatically called *Keriath,* i. e. *the reading;* and the lawyer answering our Lord from the first period of the Schemah; these things put together give strong reason to conclude, that, when our Lord asked the question, he alluded to the Schemah.

The Schemon Esre consisted of nineteen Prayers or Eulogies. Eighteen are said to have been composed by Ezra[e] and his colleagues; the twelfth, viz. that against heretics, was added by Rabbon Gamaliel. The Schemon Esre.

The Eulogies were as follows:—

"1. Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, powerful and tremendous; the high God, bountifully dispensing benefits; the Creator and possessor of the universe, who rememberest the piety of our fathers, and in love givest a Redeemer to their children for thy name's sake, O our King, our Protector, our Saviour, and Shield. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who art the Shield of Abraham. The nineteen Eulogies of the Schemon Esre.

[e] This is the opinion of Maimonides; though the 5th, 10th, 11th, 14th, and 17th Eulogies, speaking of Jerusalem as in a state of desolation, are against his opinion. Some of the Eulogies may have been composed by him, but the other tradition, from the Codex Berachoth, is more probable; according to it, R. Simeon Gossypiarius was the arranger of the form.

" 2. Thou, O Lord, art powerful for everlasting; thou dost bring to life the dead; thou art able to save; thou makest the dew to descend; thou restrainest the wind, and sendest thy showers on the earth; thou sustainest the living by thy favour, and bringest to life the dead, according to thy great mercy; thou holdest up the weak; thou healest the sick; thou loosest those that are bound, and fulfillest thy faith to them that sleep in the dust. O God, who is a God powerful like thee? who like unto thee, a Sovereign that killest and makest alive, and dost cause salvation to flourish? Thou art faithful to raise the dead. Blessed art thou, O Lord, that raisest the dead.

" 3. Thou art Holy, and thy name is Holy, and thy saints daily praise thee. Selah. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Holy God.[f]

[f] This was the Eulogy, as repeated in private: when used in public, it was as follows. " We sanctify thee, and declare thee to be our King; and three times we repeat that triple declaration of thy holiness, which thy prophet has mentioned in these words: 'And one cried to the other, Holy! Holy! Holy! is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory' (Isaiah vi. 3); and the whole world is full of his greatness: and his ministers ask, where is the place of his glory, that they may revere him; and they praise him, and say, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place. O Lord, our King, exhibit thyself to us from thy place in splendour, and reign over us, since we wait for thee. When wilt thou reign in Zion, in our life, and in our days? When wilt thou

"4. Thou of thy free mercy dost give knowledge, and teach prudence. Give to us knowledge, and wisdom, and prudence. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost graciously give knowledge unto men.[g]

inhabit Jerusalem, thy city, and be magnified and sanctified in the midst of it, from generation to generation, for ever and ever? Our eyes shall see the kingdom of thy strength, according to the word spoken by thy holy servant David, (the just one, thine anointed,) 'The Lord shall reign for ever; thy God, O Zion, through all generations.' Hallelujah! In every age we will proclaim thy greatness, and through all eternity we will sanctify thy holiness; and thy praise, O our God! shall not depart from our mouths, because thou, O God, art a strong, great, and holy King. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the holy God." This form was called the *Keduscha*.—Maimonides in Seder Tephil.

[g] At the close of the Sabbath, of the Day of Expiation, and of Festival days, they added to the fourth Eulogy as follows:—"Thou hast freely bestowed upon man knowledge, and teachest him prudence. Thou hast divided between the holy and profane; between light and darkness; between the Israelites and the Gentiles; between the seventh day and the six working days of the week. As thou hast made a distinction between the sacred and profane, so deliver and free us from every kind of crime, and from all evils of every kind, with which men are afflicted; from all these preserve us, and grant us thy grace." Whenever this addition was made to the fourth Eulogy, but seven Eulogies were recited; viz. the first and last three, and the fourth. On Sabbath-days, they concluded the Eulogy with the words; "Blessed art thou, O holy God, who dost sanctify the Sabbath;"—and on Festivals; "Blessed art thou, O holy God, who dost sanctify Israel at stated times." At the feast of Tabernacles, the antepenultimate and the penultimate were the only Eulogies recited. Other variations and

"5. O Father, bring us back to the observance of thy law, and make us cleave to thy precepts; and do thou, our King, draw us near to thy worship; and convert us to thee, by perfect repentance before thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost accept repentance.

"6. Be thou merciful unto us, O Father: for we have sinned: pardon us, O our King, for we have transgressed thy commandments. Thou art a God, good, and ready to pardon. Blessed art thou, O Lord, most gracious, who multipliest thy mercies, in the forgiveness of sins.

"7. Look, we pray thee, on our affliction, and undertake our cause, in all our contentions and strivings; and hasten our redemption, for thou, O God, art a great King, and a most powerful Redeemer. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel.

"8. Heal us, O Lord our God, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved. For thou art our praise. Grant thy all-sufficient medicine for our infirmities; for thou art our merciful Physician. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who healest the infirmities of thy people Israel.

"9. Bless us, O Lord our God, in every work of our hands; and bless our years; and grant a

additions may be seen in Maimonides, Hil. Tep. Cap. sec. 13—19, and in his work on the Order of Prayer for the whole Year.

copious dew and rain in all our land; and satisfy the world with thy blessings, and send down moisture upon the habitable earth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who givest thy blessing to the years.

"10. Call us together to our liberty, by the sound of the great trumpet; and raise the standard, to call together the dispersed Israelites, from the four quarters of the earth into our land. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest together the dispersed of thy people Israel.

"11. Bring back our judges as at the first, and our counsellors as in the beginning; and remove labour and trouble far from us, and do thou alone reign over us in grace, and mercy, in righteousness, and judgment. Blessed art thou, O Lord our King, who lovest righteousness and judgment.

"12. Let the apostates from the true religion have no hope; and let all heretics,[h] how many soever they be, suddenly perish. And let the kingdom of pride[i] be rooted out, and broken in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who destroyest the wicked, and dost bring down the proud.[k]

[h] This is the celebrated prayer added by Gamaliel against Christians.

[i] The Roman Empire.

[k] The twelfth Prayer, as now used by the Jews, varies con-

" 13. May thy compassion, O Lord our God, be extended to the pious, and the just, and to the proselytes of righteousness,[b] and to the remnant of thy people Israel; and amply reward all those, who sincerely trust in thy name; and place our portion with them. May we never be ashamed, since our trust is in thee. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the support and confidence of the righteous.

" 14. Dwell thou in the midst of Jerusalem, thy city, as thou hast promised; and build it with a building to last for ever, even now in our days.

siderably from that above given. In the Prayer Book of the *German* and *Polish Jews* it stands thus:—" O let the slanderers have no hope, all the wicked be annihilated speedily, and all the tyrants be cut off quickly; humble thou them quickly in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who destroyest enemies, and humblest tyrants." In the Prayer Book of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews this prayer runs thus:—" Let slanderers have no hope, and all presumptuous apostates perish as in a moment; and may thine enemies, and those who hate thee, be suddenly cut off, and all those who act wickedly be suddenly broken, consumed, and rooted out; and humble thou them speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who destroyest the enemies and humblest the proud." (Allen's Modern Judaism, p. 329, as quoted in Horne's Introduction, vol. iii.)

.[1] There were two kinds of proselytes, — *Proselytes of the gate*, and *Proselytes of righteousness*. The former had renounced idolatry, and were worshippers of the true God, but, without joining the Jewish Church; the latter were converts to Judaism, and as such observed the Mosaic law. Cornelius was of the former class; the Eunuch of the latter.

Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost build Jerusalem.

"15. Grant, that the seed of David thy servant, may quickly flourish; and may our horn be exalted in thy salvation, for we look for thy salvation every day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who makest the horn of our salvation to flourish.

"16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God; and spare us, and pity us, and accept our prayers, with thy mercy and favour; and do not, O our King, send us away empty from thy presence: for thou dost in mercy hear the prayers of thy people Israel. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest the prayer.

"17. O Lord our God, have pleasure in thy people Israel, and regard their prayers, and restore the Levitical worship to the shrine[m] of thy house; and speedily receive, with love and favour, the burnt sacrifices of Israel, and their prayers; and let the worship of thy people Israel be well-pleasing in thy sight. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost bring back thy Shechinah to Zion.

"18. We give thanks unto thee with praise; for thou art the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers; thou art the rock of our life, and

[m] The Holy of Holies, in which was the Ark of the Covenant; and on the Ark (in Solomon's Temple,) rested the Shechinah, the symbol of the Divine presence.

the shield of our salvation. To all generations we will give thanks to thee, and declare thy praise; for our life, which is in thy power; for our souls, which are entrusted to thee; and for thy signs, which are with us every day; and for thy wonderful works and loving-kindness, which we experience upon every occasion, in the morning, at noon, and in the evening. O thou good Being, whose mercies are not consumed; O thou merciful Being, whose kindnesses are infinite, we have long waited for thee; and for all these mercies may thy name be blessed, and exalted, for ever and ever; and may all that live give thanks unto thee. Selah. And let them in truth and sincerity praise thy name, O God of our salvation, and our help. Selah. Blessed art thou, O Lord, whose name is good, and whom it becomes us to praise.

"19. Give to us, and to thy people Israel, peace, beneficence, and blessing; grace, benignity, and mercy. Bless us all as one man, with the light of thy countenance. Thou hast given unto us, O Lord our God, the law of life, and from thy mere grace hast followed us with love, kindness, blessing, mercy, life, and peace. And it pleases thee to bless thy people Israel every time and moment. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost bless thy people Israel with peace."

This celebrated prayer may be divided into three parts. The first three Eulogies set forth generally the praises of Jehovah; the last three celebrate those attributes which are exercised in bestowing mercies upon man; the intermediate thirteen are petitions for all things necessary to soul and body.

Schemon Esre may be divided into three parts.

There was sometimes used, instead of the intermediate thirteen, a shorter form, containing, however, their substance; it was as follows:— "Grant us prudence, O Lord our God, that we may understand thy ways, and circumcise our heart. Prove thyself propitious to us, by hastening our redemption. Remove far away from us all grief; render us fruitful; and grant that we may inhabit the delightful places of thy land. Gather together the dispersed from the four regions of the earth. May the erring be judged by knowledge of thee; and turn thy hand against the impious; but let the just rejoice, in the rebuilding of thy city, in the establishing of thy Sanctuary, and in this,—that thou makest the horn of David thy servant to flourish, and givest a light to thy Messiah, the son of Jesse. Before we call, do thou answer; before we speak, do thou hear; for thou dost answer them that call, in every time of distress; thou dost redeem and deliver from every calamity. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest the prayer."

Shorter form used for the Schemon Esre.

Prayer before the Schemon Esre.

On Sabbath and Festival days, the following short prayer was used before the Schemon Esre: "O Lord, open my lips, and my mouth shall show forth thy praise." And after; "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be always acceptable in thy sight, O Lord my strength and my Redeemer."[n]

Order of Prayer.

So far for the two principal formulæ of the Jewish ritual. We come, in the next place, to the Order of Prayer; and, first, to that of Private Prayer.

Order of Private Prayer.

The following is the order of Private Prayer, as given by Maimonides.

Morning Prayer.

1. Benedictions, or Thanksgivings, for individual mercies; *e. g.* for refreshing sleep, for protection during the night. These Benedictions were repeated immediately after rising from bed, and were twenty-three in number.

2. A prayer. In the beginning of this prayer the following expressions occur:—"We lay our wants before thee, not trusting to our own righteousness, but to thy great mercy. What are we? what is our life? what our piety? what our righteousness? what our health? what our strength? what our ability? what shall we say in thy presence, O Lord our God?" The prayer concludes thus:—"Nevertheless we are thy people,

[n] Psalm xix. 14.

thy covenanted people; the offspring of Abraham, thy friend, to whom thou hast bound thyself by an oath on Mount Moriah; the seed of Isaac thy beloved, who was bound upon thine altar; the congregation of Jacob thy son, thy first born," &c. We give these extracts as conveying a fair specimen of Jewish feeling; an apparent renunciation of their own righteousness; and yet, a boasting in privileges, an exaggeration of the merits of their fathers, and that reliance upon their descent from Abraham, for which they are so justly censured by the Apostle Paul.[o]

3. The Eulogy called *Baruch Scheamar.*

4. A Selection from the Psalms. The selection varied in different congregations; Leo of Modena[p] mentions that the Psalms generally used were, from Psalm cxlv. to the end: in a Liturgy in the possession of Vitringa, the portions selected are: 1 Chron. xvi. 8—37. Psalm xcix. 5—9; lxxviii. 38; xlvi. 12; xxv. 6; lxviii. 35 to the end: there were additional portions for the Sabbath. These selections were read in a tone corresponding very nearly to our chanting.

5. The Eulogy called *Jistabbeach.* On Sabbath days there was a prayer before this Eulogy.

[o] Rom. ii. 17, 28.

[p] Consuetud. Jud. lib. i. cap. 11.

6. The Schemah, and its benedictions; omitting the sanctification of the Divine Name in the first benediction,[q] as it was not lawful for a private person to repeat it.[r]

7. The Schemon Esre, called emphatically *the Prayer*.

8. Supplications, and deprecations of the Divine anger. These may be seen in the Jewish formularies.

9. The hundred and forty-fifth Psalm.

10. A Prayer. And thus ended the morning devotion.

Evening Prayer.

The evening worship commenced with the hundred and forty-fifth Psalm; then followed the Schemah, with its Benedictions;[s] then the Schemon Esre; and lastly, a Prayer.

Such were the prayers used in private by every Israelite; and though it was not absolutely necessary, it was desirable, that they should be recited in the Synagogue.

[q] Called *Jotzer Oor*.

[r] At the Morning devotion there were two benedictions used before the Schemah, and one after. At Evening devotions, two before and two after. These Benedictions may be seen in Vitringa, p. 1054.

After the first verse of the first period of the Schemah had been recited, (viz. that which declares the unity of Jehovah,) it was usual to say in an under voice; "Blessed be the name of his glorious kingdom, for ever and ever."

[s] Viz. two before and two after the Schemah; they are to be seen in Vitringa, p. 1054.

Other prayers, also, were used in private; as at meals, when dressing, &c.; a Jew considered himself bound to recite, altogether, in the day, at least one hundred Benedictions. The number was thus made up:—

The Jews considered themselves bound to recite 100 Prayers in the day.

The twenty-three Benedictions in the morning	23
The Benedictions of the Schemah, morning and evening	7
The Benediction when putting on the Tzizith[t]	1
Ditto . . . ditto . . . the Phylacteries[u]	1
The Schemon Esre,[x] three times	54
The Benedictions at two meals, seven at each .	14
	100

We have merely to add, that the Schemah should be repeated in the morning,—some time during the first quarter of the day, commencing at sunrise; in the evening, it might be repeated any time before day-break.

[t] This was the upper garment of the Jews. They were commanded to wear fringes, at the four corners of their upper garments, of a blue colour, and a border of galoon on the edges. (Num. xv. 38. Deut. xxii. 12. Matt. ix. 20; also xxiii. 5.)

[u] Phylacteries were little rolls of parchment, in which were written certain words of the law; they were worn by the Jews upon their foreheads, and upon the wrists of their left arm. The custom was founded on a mistaken interpretation of Exod. xiii. 9—16.

[x] Supposed to consist (as it did at first) of eighteen Benedictions.

Order of Public Prayer.

The Public Service was read, or rather chanted, every day, by the Legate of the Church. The following is its order, as described by Maimonides.[y]

Morning Prayer.

The Legate of the Church, upon entering the Synagogue, finds the congregation sitting; he advances toward the ark, and, standing in the low space before it, commences the service with—

The Kaddisch.

1. *The Kaddisch.* This is the most ancient of all the Synagogal prayers. It is in the Chaldaic language, is esteemed most sacred, and cannot be used in private prayer. It runs thus: "May his great Name be extolled and hallowed in the world, which he created according to his will; may he cause his kingdom to come;[z] may his redemption flourish; may his Messiah speedily come, and may he deliver his people in your life and in your days, and in the time of the whole house of Israel, and that quickly; and say ye 'Amen, Amen.' Let his great name be blessed, for ever and ever. Let his name be celebrated, and his memory extolled, through all generations. Let the name of the Holy Blessed God be celebrated, praised, adorned, exalted, extolled, and preached, far above every Benediction and Hymn, Praise and Thanks-

[y] Hillcoth Tep. cap. ix. sec. 1.

[z] Evidently similar to two petitions in the Lord's prayer.

giving, ascribed to things in the world; and say ye, 'Amen.' In pity, and with favour, receive our prayers; may the prayers and the desires of all Israel be received before their Father, who is in heaven; and say ye, 'Amen.' May the name of the Lord be blessed, from this time forth for evermore; may there be great peace from heaven, and life for us and for all Israel; and say ye, 'Amen.'" This formula was prefixed, and subjoined, to every public act of devotion: at the end of the Kaddisch,

2. *The People* answer; "Amen. Let his great name be blessed, for ever and ever."

3. *The Legate;* "Bless ye the blessed God."[a]

4. *People;* "Blessed be the blessed Lord, for ever and to everlasting."

5. The Schemah, with its Eulogies, is recited by the Legate, in a loud voice; the people answering, "Amen," after each Eulogy.

6. The Schemon Esre, with the Keduscha,[b] all standing up. This prayer was repeated, first in silence, by each member of the congregation; and then aloud, by the Legate of the Church; the people answering "Amen," after each Eulogy. Several ceremonies were observed when repeating

[a] This short form was called the *Barechu*, and could not be used in private.

[b] The *Keduscha* is the declaration of God's holiness in the third Eulogy.

this form: when repeated in silence, each person bowed five times; viz. at the beginning and end of the first Benediction, at the beginning and end of the eighteenth;[c] and when the prayer was ended, the whole congregation bowed again, and receded three steps: then the Legate commenced the Prayer aloud; when he came to the Keduscha, every one returned to his former place.

7. All sit down, and inclining the head, pray for a time; then they fall on their faces;[d] afterwards they sit down, and raising the head, pray in an under voice.

8. The Legate stands up, and recites the Kaddisch; the people answering as before.

9. The Prayer, *Vehu Rachum.*

10. The 145th Psalm, the people repeating the Psalm with him.

11. The forms, *Uva Letzion,* ("The Redeemer will come to Zion;") *Vaani Sooth* ("This is my covenant"); and *Beatta Kadasch* ("Thou art holy.")

12. The Keduscha; first in Hebrew, then in Chaldaic.

13. The Prayer, *Vatissaim Ruach* ("And the Spirit sustained me;") first in Hebrew, then in Chaldaic: other prayers followed. Then

[c] Called *Modim.*

[d] On sabbath-days, as also on solemn festivals, and at the daily evening service, there was no prostration in prayer.

14. The Kaddisch; and the congregation is dismissed.

It appears, then, that, besides the declaration of God's Holiness in the Kaddisch, there was a threefold solemn declaration of it, in the other parts of the service; viz. in the *Jotzer Oor,* in the *Keduscha,* and in the *Uva Letzion.* Our Lord, in all probability, accommodated to this threefold declaration, the first three petitions of his prayer. Threefold solemn declaration of God's holiness in Public Service.

The following is the order of the Afternoon service:—

1. The 84th Psalm, from the fifth verse to the end; and the 145th Psalm, the whole congregation sitting. Order of afternoon prayer.

2. All standing up; the Kaddisch is recited.

3. The Schemon Esre; first, in silence, by the congregation; then aloud, by the Legate.

4. Supplications and deprecations, as in the morning, *vide* No. 7.

5. The Kaddisch; and then the congregation is dismissed.

The following is the order of Evening Prayer:— Order of Evening Prayer.

1. The Formula; *Vehu Rachum.*

2. The Barechu, and its response.

3. The Kaddisch.

4. The Schemah, with the Evening Eulogies.

5. The Schemon Esre, in silence only. (It was not repeated aloud at the Evening service.)

6. The Kaddisch; then the congregation is dismissed.

On Sabbath and Festival days, they observed the following order:—

Order of prayer on sabbath and festival days.

1. The usual Morning prayer.
2. The Kaddisch.
3. *The Reading of the Law.*
4. The 145th Psalm.
5. The Kaddisch.
6. Additional Prayers; first in silence, by the congregation; then aloud, by the Legate.
7. The Kaddisch.[e]

The services in the synagogue during the day.

There were, then, three different meetings for prayer during the day: the Morning prayer should be over before the fourth hour; the Afternoon prayer was offered up between the ninth hour and sunset; whilst no exact space of time was assigned for the Evening prayer.[f] These different services were supposed to answer to the threefold daily sacrifice; and, as on Sabbath and Festival days, there were in the temple additional sacrifices, so there were in the synagogue additional

[e] At Sabbath-morning service, they omitted the prayers No. 7, as also the formula *Uva Letzion*, No. 11. These were reserved for the Afternoon service, and came in after the 145th Psalm.

[f] The attendance at Evening service was not considered to be absolutely necessary, and was, therefore, left to the discretion of each individual. In modern synagogues, the afternoon prayers are recited just before sunset, and the evening prayers follow immediately after.

prayers: on the day of Atonement, there were five different times of prayer.

The Blessing was pronounced after the eighteenth Eulogy, and was as follows:—"The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."[g] When the Legate came to the seventeenth Eulogy, every Priest in the synagogue ascended the pulpit, and turning towards the Ark, recited aloud, with the Legate and the whole congregation, the eighteenth Eulogy. They then repeated by themselves the words; "The Lord bless thee:" after which the Legate read the blessing; the Priests repeating it after him, word by word, and the congregation answering, "Amen," after each verse. The blessing pronounced in the synagogue.

If there were no Priest present,[h] lest the con-

[g] Num. vi. 24, &c. This benediction was not pronounced at the Afternoon service; they feared lest, perchance, the priests might drink too freely after dinner, and thus be unfitted to perform this sacred duty, with a reverence suited to that Divine Being, whose character they (as it were) sustained.

[h] It may be asked, is it possible, in the general confusion of the tribes, to determine, who are priests, *i. e.* lineally descended from Aaron? When we consider the strictness observed by the priests in their marriages, a strictness to which Josephus bears testimony, (against Apion, book i. chap. 7,) it is not improbable, but that some have preserved their lineal succession unimpaired; though there can be scarcely a doubt,

Form of benediction when no priest was present.

gregation should depart without any blessing, the Legate used the following form:—"O Lord, our God, the God of our fathers, bless us with that triple blessing which is in the law, written by Moses thy servant, spoken by Aaron and his sons the priests; as it is written, 'The Lord bless thee, &c.'" When this form of blessing was used, the people did not answer, "Amen."

II. THE READING OF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS.

Manner of reading the Law.

Whenever the Law was to be read, after the Legate of the Church had closed the usual Morning prayer, with the solemn formula, called the Kaddisch, the Chazzan brought forth the Sacred Volume amidst the acclamations of the people. The reader was then called out, who, ascending the pulpit, read his portion, using first, however, this short form:—

Doxology before reading the Law.

Reader. "Bless ye the blessed God."

People. "Praised be the blessed God, for ever and ever."

Reader. "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, Governor of the world; who hast chosen us

but that some who assert their descent from Aaron, and whose claim is acknowledged by their brethren, have no ground for their claim. That some, to this very day, are acknowledged as priests, appears from their still retaining the custom of redeeming the first born, at the price of five shekels.—Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. cap. 6.

from all people, and hast given to us thy law. Blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast given to us thy law."

People. "Amen."

When the Reader had finished his portion, he repeated the following Doxology: "Blessed be thou, O Lord, the Ruler of the world; who hast given to us thy law, the law of truth, and hast planted eternal life amongst us. Blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast given to us thy law." When he had repeated this form, he descended from the pulpit: the second Reader was then called out, who read his portion, using the same forms, and so on, till the lesson for the day was entirely read. Doxology after.

A napkin was thrown over the Sacred Volume between each reading: the last Reader closed the book, and stood before the Ark till it was deposited therein: hence to be the last Reader was considered an honour, and was frequently purchased at a price.

The Law (as well as the other Scriptures) was read in the Hebrew tongue,[i] from a copy written in square Assyrian characters,[k] without Scrupulous accuracy of the Jews in the reading of the Law.

[i] At the feast of Purim, it was considered to be the duty of every Jew to hear the Megilla (*i. e.* the Volume of Esther) read: if, however, a Jew did not understand Hebrew, he might hear the Megilla in any language he did understand; but the hearing it in Hebrew sufficed, whether he understood the language or not.

[k] *Vide* Appendix, Note (I.)

the vowel points. We mentioned in a preceding chapter,[1] how scrupulously careful the Jews were in writing out the Law for the use of the Synagogue. They were equally careful in the reading; "If an error in the manuscript was detected, when the reading was about to commence, another volume was brought out, the reading should commence from the passage in which the error was detected, and another Reader should be called. If an error was detected in the midst of the reading, a correct copy should be brought out in which the Reader finished his portion."[m] "If there were various readings, they should read according to *Keri*, (i. e. the marginal reading), and not according to the *Ketif*, (i. e. the reading in the text.")[n] "If the volume of the Law was not complete, (though the use of such a volume was only permitted in extreme cases,) they could not pronounce the solemn Benediction."[o] The greatest accuracy was required in the Reader; the wrong pronunciation, of even a letter, was corrected; and so particular were they at the Sabbath-morning service, that if, by any accident, a verse had been omitted, although the reading had terminated,

[1] Chapter V. p. 48.

[m] Orach. Chaum, cap. clxiii. sec. 4.

[n] Cap. cxli. sec. 8. [o] Cap. clxiii. sec. 2, 3.

and all the subsequent services had been gone through, still the reading should be repeated, and the error corrected.

Sometimes the lesson of the day was a selection, from different parts of the Sacred Volume; (this occurred chiefly on Festival days.) On such occasions it was not considered decorous to unrol the book, in order to find out the second passage, but another volume was produced, from which they read the second portion; and similarly if there were a third portion; after the reading of each, they recited the Kaddisch.[p]

Qualifications of those who read in the synagogue.

The only qualifications required in the Reader were, that he should be free, decently dressed, and not blind:[q] so much stress did they place upon the first qualification, that "If a master should order his slave to read three verses of the Pentateuch in the synagogue, the slave was thenceforth free, and could compel his master to give him a bill of discharge."[r] Hence, the permitting a slave to read in the synagogue became the usual mode of conferring freedom.

[p] Cap. xliv. sec. 3.

[q] Though a blind man could repeat from memory, he was not permitted to stand in the pulpit. A minor, if qualified, could be called on.

[r] Hilcoth Avadim, cap. 8.

At the reading of the Law preference was given to a Priest or Levite.

If a Priest or Levite were present, he had always the precedence, (except on Sabbath and Festival days, when a Priest might yield his privilege of reading first, to a doctor of repute, or to the head of a school.) The following is to be found amongst the canons, which direct the manner of reading in the synagogue :—"If there be no Priest in the synagogue, some Israelite stands up to read; after which, no Levite at all is permitted to read. If there be a Priest present, and no Levite, the Priest reads the first, and also the second portion, in place of the Levite; but no other Priest is permitted to read after him; and similarly, a Levite is not permitted to read after another Levite, lest it might be said that either of them was disapproved of."[s]

Number of Readers.

At Sabbath-morning service, there were seven readers; on the Day of Expiation, six; on Festival days, five, at least; on New Moons and the eves of Festivals, four. On Sabbath evenings, on the evening of the Day of Expiation, and on Mondays and Thursdays,[t] there were three readers.

It might so happen, that there was but one present qualified to read; in such a case the one person read all the portions; but then, between each of the readings, he should descend from

[s] Orach Chaum. cap. cxxxv. sec. 6, 8, 9.

[t] The law was always read on Mondays and Thursdays,

the pulpit, resume his seat, and be again called, as if he were a distinct person from the former Reader.[u]

Interpretation of the Law.

About the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Hebrew ceased to be the language spoken by the Jews; hence the necessity of an Interpreter. The Interpreter was always a different person from the Reader, and inferior in rank. One Interpreter was allowed for the Law; two for the Prophets. After each verse in the Law, followed the interpretation; but three verses of the Prophets were read before they were interpreted; and whilst they were most scrupulous, that the Reader of the Law should not pronounce one word from memory, but read from the manuscript; they were equally scrupulous, that the interpretation should be altogether from memory.

Five passages never interpreted.

There were five passages which they never interpreted; viz. the history of Reuben;[x] the latter part of the history of the golden calf;[y] the adultery of David;[z] the incest of Amnon;[a] and the sacerdotal benediction.[b] The first four passages were not interpreted, because they reflected on the memory of fathers of their nation; the sacerdotal

[u] Hilcoth Tephil, cap. xii. sec. 17.

[x] Gen. xxxv. 22.

[y] Exod. xxxii. 21, &c. It is remarkable that Josephus (in his Antiquities) makes no mention of the golden calf; vide Book vii. chap. 5.

[z] 2 Sam. xi. 2, &c.

[a] 2 Sam. xiii. 1, 2, &c.

[b] Numb. vi. 24, 25, 26.

benediction, in order that it might be heard with greater reverence.

The Reader and Interpreter always stood. In modern synagogues, the congregation, in general, sit during the reading of the Law;[c] though it appears from the Book of Nehemiah,[d] that in the time of Ezra they stood.

Sections in the Pentateuch for the convenience of reading.

The five books of Moses were read through, once every year, commencing on the Sabbath following the Feast of Tabernacles; and for the convenience of reading, the Pentateuch was divided into fifty-four sections, called *Paraschioth.* These sections are marked (in printed Bibles) by a triple ס or ס, (the initials of the Hebrew words signifying *open* and *shut;*) in manuscript Bibles, the sections are separated from each other by large blank intervals. The Paraschioth were subdivided into minor sections distinguished by a single ס or ס.

At Sabbath morning service, an entire Parascha[e] was read, divided amongst seven readers; at Sabbath evening service, they commenced the next Parascha, continued reading from it the following Monday and Thursday; and then read

[c] Orach Chaum, cap. cxlvi. sec. 4. [d] Neh. viii. 5.

[e] The different Paraschioth selected for the Sabbath services may be seen in Maimonides, (Hilcoth Teph. cap. xiii. sec. 13;) as also in Horne's Introduction, vol. iii. They were not the same in every Synagogue.

the entire of it, on the next Sabbath morning. On Festival days, such as the Feasts of Passover, of Pentecost, of Tabernacles, on the Day of Expiation, &c., there were proper lessons; they therefore passed by the Parascha of the week, and read the Parascha appointed for the festival.

Manner of reading the Prophets in the Synagogue.

The Reading of the Prophets.—The Jews included under the head of *The Prophets*, not only such books as were really prophetical in their matter, but every book, also, of which a prophet was the author; and thus, under this head were comprehended the Books of Joshua and Judges, the two Books of Samuel, and the two Books of Kings. Selections from these Books were read on Sabbath and Festival days.

The reading of the Prophets preceded by the Law.

The reading of the Prophets was always preceded by that of the Law. The prophetic service, therefore, commenced after the second Doxology, and it was as follows:—

Reader. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, Governor of the world; who hast chosen good prophets, and art pleased with their predictions, which they spake in truth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who didst appoint a law, and Moses thy servant, and Israel thy people, and prophets just and true."

Then follows the selection from the Prophets; and then—

Reader. "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God: Governor of this world; Rock of all ages; just

throughout all generations; the faithful God; who performest what thou sayest, and dost ratify what thou dost speak; for all thy sayings are truth and justice."

The whole congregation, rising, answer,— "Thou art faithful, O Lord our God; thy words are faithful; faithful, living, and stedfast is thy name; and thy remembrance is everlasting. Mayest thou rule over us for ever and ever."

Reader. "Thou art the faithful one. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the powerful God; faithful in all thy words."

People. "Amen."

Reader. "O Lord our God, have compassion upon Zion thy city, &c. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who makest Zion to rejoice by building her up."

People. "Amen."

Reader. "O Lord our God, make us to rejoice . . . . . for thou wilt not extinguish our light for ever. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called; Jehovah our Righteousness. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who exaltest the horn of Salvation of thy people Israel."

People. "Amen."

Reader. "O Lord our God, we give thee thanks for the Law and the Prophets, and for this sacred day, N. (mentioning the name of the day) which thou hast given us, O Lord our God; for sancti-

fication and rest, to thy honour and glory. We always praise thy name, O God of our salvation. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost sanctify Israel, and this day. Amen." On the Sabbath day, this Doxology ended thus: "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost consecrate the Sabbath; for the Sabbath is more ancient than Israel; as it is written; 'for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh he rested and was refreshed.' Whence they say; 'Attend, because God hath given to you the Sabbath which long since has been.'"

The Prophets, when read.

A selection from the Prophets was read at every Sabbath morning service, and on Festival and Fast days. On Sabbath evenings, Mondays, and Thursdays, though the Law was read, there was no reading from the Prophets.

Number of verses read.

The number of verses usually read was twenty-one, unless the argument was finished in a smaller number. If there was an interpretation, ten verses sufficed.

The portion selected for the day was called the *Haphtara* of the day; and the Reader, the *Maphti*;[f] because the reading from the Prophets finished the reading for that service.

Reader of the Prophets.

The Reader of the Prophets was, in general, a different person from any of the Readers of the Law, except on the evening of the Feast of Atone-

[f] Each word is derived from a root that signifies to dismiss, or finish.

ment, and on Fast days; when the last Reader of the Law was appointed to read from the Prophets.

Hagiographa seldom read.

The Hagiographa[g] were very seldom read. The Psalms were altogether omitted, because they occurred so frequently in their formularies; the other books were used only at the Feasts of Tabernacles, Passover, Pentecost, and Purim,[h] and at the solemn fast in the month of July.

When they read from the Hagiographa, the second Benediction used was as follows:—

Reader. "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, Governor of the world, who hast sanctified us by thy precepts, and hast commanded the reading of the Hagiographa."[i]

Mention of the reading the Law and the Prophets in the New Testament.

There is frequent mention of the reading of the Law and the Prophets in the New Testament;[k] the reading of the former, dates its origin from the times of Ezra; and Jewish writers, almost universally, agree in dating the origin of the reading of the Prophets from the restoration of the Temple by the Maccabees.

[g] The Hagiographa, *i.e. the Holy Writings*, comprehended the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah (reckoned as one book), and the two books of Chronicles, (likewise reckoned as one book.) These books all came under the name of *Psalms*.

[h] Esther ix. 21, &c. [i] Codex Sop., cap. xiv. sec. 4.

[k] Acts xiii. 15; xv. 22. Luke xvi. 29. 2 Cor. iii. 15.

THE

SYNAGOGUE AND THE CHURCH.

PART II.

THE CHURCH, COMPARED WITH THE SYNAGOGUE.

CHAPTER I.

Probable Source from which the Apostles derived the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

No form of government or of worship prescribed in Scripture for the Christian Church.

We have no means of ascertaining, directly, from the sacred Scriptures, the form of worship or of government adopted in the early Christian Church. Our blessed Lord has left no rules upon this subject; his Apostles are equally silent; they exhort the Christians of their day, "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together;"[a] but we cannot collect from their writings, after what model, or in what form, they worshipped. We must have recourse, then,

[a] Heb. x. 25.

to indirect proofs; and from these we shall find, that there is strong presumptive evidence, amounting almost to certainty, that the early Christians, when ordering and arranging their places and forms of worship, the discipline, the government, &c. of their Church, had especially in view the Jewish Synagogue.

Strong presumption that the Apostles would introduce (as much as possible) Jewish customs into the Christian Church

And, in the first place, there is a strong presumption, that, if any of the rites and customs of the Old Dispensation could have been adopted in the New, the Apostles would have adopted them; for they were Jews, and a pertinacious adherence to doctrines and rites, was a peculiar trait of Jewish character. Thus Josephus boasts, all through his writings, that a Jew would sooner give up his life, than his religious observances; and that the Apostles were, in this respect, every whit Jews, is evident from their history. No one conversant with Scripture is ignorant of Peter's vacillating conduct;[b] his desire to adhere to Jewish customs.[c] The Apostle Paul, who wrote so strongly on the subject of circumcision, yet circumcised Timothy, on account of the Jews.[d] The same feeling seems to have animated the whole body of the Apostles; they gave in to the prejudices of their countrymen, in things which they must have known were to be

[b] Gal. ii. 12. [c] Acts x. 14.

[d] Acts xvi. 3.

abolished: thus they frequented the Temple, they observed the feasts;[e] the entire Presbytery at Jerusalem induced the Apostle Paul to bind himself by the vow of a Nazarite, merely to soften down the prejudices of some Judaizing Christians;[f] and the same Presbytery, when assembled for the purpose of determining, whether the Gentiles were to be under the Law, absolve them alone from the yoke, without making any declaration, in their decree, respecting the Jews.[g] These facts show us the feelings of the Apostles; that they would not willingly lay aside any Jewish custom, which could be transferred into the Christian Church. They had two models before them; the Temple, and the Synagogue. The question then is; which of these two did they take as their model?

There are great names on both sides of the question. Of those who hold, that the Temple was the model of the Church, none state their views more clearly than Archbishop Usher, whose arguments will be examined in a subsequent chapter; on the other side are the names of Lightfoot, Selden, Dodwell, Spencer, Grotius.

[e] Acts xviii. 21. [f] Acts xxi. 20, &c.

[g] Acts xv. 19. It is evident from the address of the Apostle Peter on this occasion, that it was known at this time, that the Law was to be abrogated: "Why tempt ye God; to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" Verse 10.

It is our design, in this second part, to show, that the Apostles, when modelling the Church, took for their pattern the Synagogue, and not the Temple.

There is a presumption at first sight that the Apostles took the Synagogue for their model, and not the Temple.

And indeed, it might fairly be presumed that they would do so; for the Temple service was not at all adapted to Christian worship. The Temple was *the House of Sacrifice,* rather than the house of Prayer:[h] it was *the Habitation of God,* i. e. the place where alone he put his name, and dwelt;[i] rather than the place for the assembling of men. True, Jehovah has even now his Temple, but it is not a building of wood and stone: the Church, the Congregation of Believers, is now the House of God; Jesus Christ, its great and only High Priest, its foundation, and chief corner-stone: and believers in him are the living stones of this Temple; "built up a *spiritual house, an holy priesthood;* to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."[k]

[h] Public prayer, the reading and explaining the Scriptures, formed no part of the usual worship of the Temple. When the victim was prepared to be offered, the priests retired and prayed in silence (Tam. iv. sec. 3); the people also prayed without in silence (Luke i. 4.)

[i] Hence the name of Ναὸς, from *ναίειν*, "to dwell." See Hinds's "Three Temples."

[k] 1 Pet. ii. 5.

CHAPTER II.

Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue as places of Prayer.

The points of agreement between the Church and the Synagogue are many and striking; indeed, sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind, as to the origin from which the Church derived its government, its orders, its forms and ceremonies; we will in this chapter trace the analogy between the Church and the Synagogue, as buildings set apart for public worship: and

The analogies between the Church and Synagogue many and striking.

1. The Synagogues of the Jews, and the Churches of Christians, were used for purposes exactly similar. The Jews assembled in their Synagogues for prayer, to sing praises to their God, and to hear his word read to them, and explained. Now, in what respect was the worship of the Christian different from this? he went to his Church to pray, to sing praises, to hear God's word. If we except the partaking of the communion of the body and blood of Christ (the peculiar object of Christian worship,) the Jew frequented

1. Churches and Synagogues used for similar purposes.

the Synagogue for exactly the same purpose that the Christian frequented the Church.

2. Christian Churches and Jewish Synagogues called by the same names.

2. The places of meeting, of both Christians and Jews, were called by the same name, viz. (*Synagogues*): we have proof of this in the Epistle of St. James;[a] Grotius, in his Commentary on the Acts,[b] shows, that this was the name generally given to Christian places of worship. The usual appellations of the Synagogue were likewise applied to the Churches of Christians; thus Eusebius calls them, "Venerable schools of virtue,"[c] the very appellation by which Synagogues are designated by Philo.

3. Striking similarity in the manner of building Churches and Synagogues.

3. There was a striking similarity in the buildings themselves. The Jews built their Synagogues, with the end in which the ark was placed toward Jerusalem; the same rule was observed in building Christian places of worship. It is a fact, authenticated by early writers, that Christians prayed toward the East. Now, the majority of the early Christian churches being to the West of Jerusalem, undoubtedly gave rise to this assertion; for that it was not universally the case, appears from the testimony of

[a] Chap. ii. 2. [b] Chap. xv. 21.

[c] *τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς διδασκαλεῖα.* It is remarkable, that Christian places of prayer are never called Temples in Scripture. The Christian is "a religion without any Temple, except the collected congregation of the worshippers themselves."—*Archbishop Whately's Kingdom of Christ*, p. 96.

Socrates, who relates, in his Ecclesiastical History,[d] that the church of Antioch had its altar looking towards the West, *i.e.* toward Jerusalem. Again, in the Synagogue, the chief articles of furniture were, the *Desk*, the *Pulpit*, and in the East end the *Ark:* and in the Church, there was the *Desk*, the *Pulpit* for reading and explaining the word of God;[e] and at the East end the *Altar*[f] (more properly the communion table). In the Churches, as well as in the Synagogues, there were seats, some more honourable than others,[g] and also seats for the women, apart from the men.[h]

4. There was a remarkable agreement between the dedication or consecration of a Synagogue, and that of an early Christian Church. A Synagogue was looked upon as consecrated, if prayer in the most simple form had been offered therein;[i] just similar was the consecration of a Church. "Churches are dedicated by prayers," says Selden.[k] Dodwell mentions, how that

4. Similarity in the dedication of a Synagogue and a Church.

[d] Book v. chap. 25.

[e] Socrates's Ecclesiastical History, book vi. chap. 5.

[f] The Christian is a religion, without any altar for sacrifice; for its only sacrifice, is that offered up by its Founder in his own person. *See* "Kingdom of Christ."

[g] James ii. 2, 3.

[h] Constitutiones Apostolicæ, book ii. chap. 61.

[i] See Part i. chap. ii. page 9.

[k] De Syned. lib. iii. cap. 15.

amongst the Africans, the word rendered "*to dedicate*," is the same as that which is rendered "*to begin*;" and assigns as the reason for this, "that in the consecration of sacred places, the first sacred offices hold the place of a dedication."[l] Athanasius was at one time accused of dedicating a place of worship, without the permission of the Emperor; we learn from his answer, that the whole dedication consisted in going through the usual service."[m]

5. Synagogue and Church might be built in any place.

5. The Temple should be built in a certain place chosen by Jehovah himself.[n] The synagogue was in no way restricted as to place; one might be built, wherever there were ten free Israelites. Just so is the Christian Church; a Christian congregation can meet any where. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."[o] "I will, therefore," saith the Apostle, "that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands."[p] "The hour cometh," saith our Lord, "when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipper shall worship the Father, in spirit and in truth: for the

[l] Dissert. Cyprian x. ad Epist. 33.
[m] Athanas. Apol. ad Constan.
[n] Deut. xii. 5, 6.
[o] Matt. xviii. 20.
[p] 1 Tim. ii. 8.

Father seeketh such to worship him."[q] This state of things the prophet Malachi had before predicted; "*In every place* incense shall be offered unto the name of the Lord, and a pure offering."[r]

Synagogue and the Church in later times assimilated to the Temple.

The Jews in later times were most anxious, that their Synagogues should resemble the Temple, as nearly as possible; and thus each Synagogue had *a Porch, a Holy Place, a Sanctuary.*[s] In process of time, Christians also began to assimilate their places of worship to the Temple:[t] and hence we meet in Church writers, frequent mention of *the Porch,*[u] (where penitents and catechumens worshipped, and to which Jews, and even pagans were sometimes admitted, to witness the magnificence of Christian worship;) the *holy place* or *nave,* (where believers of all ranks worshipped;) whilst within the *sanctuary,* (separated from the nave by a railing, and somewhat elevated,) was the altar and the throne for the Bishops and Priests. We need not, then,

[q] John iv. 21, 23. [r] Chap. i. 11.

[s] Viz. a recess in which the Ark was placed.

[t] Not only did they call their places of worship—Temples, but also, their presbyters—Priests (*Hiereis*); their communion-tables—Altars; the gifts offered—Sacrifices. Now, to any one acquainted with the worship and customs of the Temple, it must be evident, that there was no foundation for such an application of terms.

[u] Πρόναος.

be surprised, that, with such feelings, they began to imitate, in the consecration and daily worship of their Churches, the pompous ceremonies of the Jewish Temple.

Minor points of agreement.

Other points of agreement may be observed, not perhaps so striking, but still all strengthening the presumption, that in the arrangement and ordering of their Churches, the early Christians had a special view to the Jewish Synagogue. Thus, if there was a law, "That no one should eat or sleep in a Synagogue;" the eighteenth Canon of the Council of Laodicea proclaims it to be unlawful, "to celebrate the Agapæ in Churches, or to eat or sleep in the house of God." If lamps were lighted in the Synagogue, not merely for use, but as an act of piety, the same custom prevailed in the Christian Church. Sozomen mentions, that when the Arian faction came to drive Melam from his bishopric, they found him preparing the lamps of the Church as its lowest servant. In a word, if we attentively consider the laws made in the early ages, respecting the Church and its furniture, the reverence and respect due to it; there is scarcely a law to be found, that is not derived from the Canons of the Synagogue.

CHAPTER III.

The Government of the Early Church compared with that of the Synagogue.

The Synagogue, in its early state, was governed by a Council; so was the early Church. There is a striking correspondence between the Councils of the Church, and those of the Synagogue. And

Church as well as Synagogue governed by a Council.

1. In the names given to the members of these Councils. Thus, the Rulers of the Synagogue are called by St. Luke *Presbyters;*[a] the very same name is given, by the same Evangelist, to the ministers of the Christian Church.[b] May we not, from this identity of name, conclude, that the Rulers of the Christian Church held, amongst their people, a rank and office similar to that of the Presbyters of the Jewish Church; and that the name and office was derived to the Christian Church from it. Again,

These Councils similar:—1. In the names given to their members.

[a] Πρεσβύτεροι, Acts iv. 8; xxiv. 1.

[b] Acts xiv. 23; xv. 22; xx. 17.

the name, Parnas (Pastor), was frequently given to the members of the Jewish Councils; (the lay Council of the Modern Synagogue is called Parnasim.[c]) The Rulers of the Early Church were also called Pastors;[d] thus, the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, says; "He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers;"[e] and that these Pastors were the Bishops and Presbyters of the Church, is evident from these passages, in which it is said to be the Bishops' and Presbyters' office, *to feed*[f] the flock of Christ. Again, the Rulers of the Synagogue were called *Overseers* or *Bishops*. Thus Benjamin of Tudela, speaking of the city of Ispahan, where there

[c] See Part I. Chap. VI. page 58.

[d] Ποιμένες. The name, Pastor, or Shepherd, was given to those persons, whose office it was to guide or direct. Hence, we find it given by the heathen poets to kings. We read in Homer of Agamemnon, the Shepherd of the people:—

Ἀγαμέμνονα ποιμένα λαῶν.

(The names of several Eastern princes are compounded of the Hebrew word Pharnas (Pastor); for instance, Pharnabazus, Holophernes, Tissaphernes, &c.) It is a name given to the Son of God; "I am the Good Shepherd," John x. 11; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 25. It is a name given to Jehovah himself; "The Lord is my Shepherd," saith David, "therefore I shall not want," Psalm xxiii. 1. See Ezek. xxxiv. 23; Jeremiah iii. 15.

[e] Chap. iv. 11.

[f] ποιμαίνειν, Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2.

were fifteen thousand Jews, says, "that excellent Doctor Sarschalon, who is the Bishop, lives there."[g] Speaking of another city, he says, "In it are fifty thousand Jews, and Rabbi Obadiah is their Bishop."[h] The same name is given to the Pastors of the Modern Synagogue;[i] and every one will assent, that it was a title given to the Rulers of the Primitive Church.

2. As the same names were given to the Rulers of the Synagogue and to those of the Church, so similar qualifications were required in each. If it were necessary, that the Ruler of the Synagogue should be a Doctor, and one who had ministered unto an Elder Doctor, (just as Joshua ministered unto Moses, and Elisha unto Elijah, before they succeeded to their respective offices;) so the Ruler or Bishop of the Christian Church should be a Doctor, (*one fit to teach.*[k]) Like the Jewish Doctors, the Christian Bishops had their Deacons, who ministered unto them, (as Timotheus and Erastus did to the Apostle Paul,[l]) and who, by constant attendance, and constantly giving heed to their instructions, were in time fitted to be the Heads and Directors of

2. In the qualifications required in these members.

[g] Itin. page 96. [h] Itin. page 97.

[i] Buxtorf. Synag. Jud. cap. xliv. Orach. cap. cxxxvi. fol. 56.

[k] διδακτικὸς, 1 Tim. iii. 2. [l] Acts xix. 22; xiii. 5.

Churches. Again, the Ruler of the Synagogue, (especially he that offered up prayer in the Congregation,) should be a Married man. "It is the custom that no one shall offer up prayer in public, unless he be Married, after the example of the High Priest, concerning whom our Rabbies of blessed memory say, he has a wife to preserve him from sin."[m] The Codex Taanith enjoins; "That at the public fasts, he that offers up the prayers shall have children at home, that thus he may pray with more fervour." Similarly the Apostle enjoins; "That a Bishop be the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly."[n] "One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection, with all gravity."[o] The other qualifications of a Christian Bishop may be seen in the Chapters from Timothy and Titus above quoted; by comparing them with those required in the Ruler of the Synagogue, we shall find a marked resemblance.[p]

There is a remarkable agreement between the Church and the Synagogue, in the non-requirement of a qualification indispensable in the Temple; viz. the qualification of age. A Levite should be twenty years of age, before he could

[m] In Colbo, cap. 65.

[n] Titus i. 6. *Vide* Appendix Note (K.)

[o] 1 Tim. iii. 4.

[p] *Vide* Vitringa, 938.

enter upon his duties:[q] a Priest should be thirty. In neither the Church nor the Synagogue, was there any such qualification; a minor could perform some of the sacred offices in the Synagogue; Timothy,[r] though a youth, had the superintendence of a Church.

3. In their constitution.

3. There is an analogy not only between the members of the respective Councils, but also between the bodies themselves. Thus, the Jewish Council is styled *The Presbytery;*[s] the same name is given to the Council of the Christian Church;[t] and what makes this agreement the more remarkable, is the fact, that the word Presbytery is a word altogether unknown in profane authors, and used only by the writers of the New Testament, and by Ecclesiastical writers. Again, the Jewish Council was composed of the Elders of the Church and a presiding Rabbi; the Christian was composed of Apostles and Elders, and a President.[u] Again, sitting was the posture of the Doctors in the Jewish Councils;[x] the Apostle Paul, when describing the Church of Corinth assembled in council for the discussion of divine things, leads us to suppose that a similar posture was observed

[q] 1 Chron. xxiii. 24.
[r] 1 Tim. iv. 12.
[s] πρεσβυτέριον, Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5.
[t] 1 Tim. iv. 14.
[u] Acts xv. 16.
[x] See Part I. Chap. III. page 15.

in the Christian Church: that the Doctors sat, the people stood; "If any thing," he says, "be revealed to *a person sitting;*"[y] i.e. to an Elder or Member of the Council. The form of admission to membership, was in both Churches the same; viz. by imposition of hands.[z] In fine, the assemblies of the Early Christians are described both by Justin Martyr,[a] and Tertullian;[b] and the descriptions, by these writers, bear so close a resemblance to the Councils of the Synagogue, as to leave not a shadow of doubt, as to the latter being their model.

4. Similarity in the names given to Members of the Congregation.

4. The Followers of Jewish Doctors were called *Disciples;* the Followers of the Lord Jesus are called by the same name,[c] and this too by his own command; his parting exhortation to the Apostles being, "Go ye therefore and *make Disciples*[d] in all nations.

All Churches at first under the control of the Church at Jerusalem.

As long as Jerusalem was the metropolis of Judæa, the chief seat of the Christian religion; so long, the Presbytery at Jerusalem was looked upon as the bond of union, and the root of the whole Christian Church. If any controversy arose, it was submitted to their judgment; if any

[y] καθημένῳ, 1 Cor. xiv. 30. *See* Appendix, Note (F.)
[z] 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; *Vide* Part I. Chap. IX.
[a] Apol. ii. p. 97, 98.
[b] Apol. adversus Gentes, lib. ii. cap. 39.
[c] John vi. 66; ix. 28. [d] μαθητεύσατε, Matt. xxviii. 19.

new teacher was desirous of introduction to a Church, he should have his authority from Jerusalem. Thus, when the question arose, whether the believing Gentiles were to bear the yoke of the Law, the Church of Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas to the Presbytery at Jerusalem, and they passed sentence in the matter.[e] The Apostle Paul, though immediately called and instructed by the Lord Jesus, yet explained his doctrines to the Church at Jerusalem; and being commended by them preached the Gospel to the Gentiles.[f]

In after times all Churches independent.

But when the Apostles and apostolic men were either dead, or dispersed abroad, when Jerusalem was destroyed, and the Church transferred to Pella: the authority of the Church at Jerusalem altogether ceased. Some Christians, indeed, resought the devastated city, and settled there under a head of the house of David:[g] but no church acknowledged to this afflicted body, any peculiar prerogative; all Presbyteries were looked upon as equal in right, authority, and dignity; *each Presbytery, and its President or Bishop, being independent of all others.*

As appears from the testimony of Cyprian, Jerome, and Ignatius.

Of the truth of this latter position, there is abundant evidence in the ancient Fathers; we will cite, in the first place, the opinion delivered

[e] Acts xv. 2, &c. [f] Gal. ii. 2, 9; *vide* 2 Cor. iii. 1.

[g] Euseb. lib. iii. cap. 11.

by Cyprian, at the council of Carthage, with respect to the baptizing Heretics. "It remains for us, each to declare our sentiments on this subject; neither judging any one, nor depriving any individual of the right of communion, because he may be of a different opinion; since not any of us has made himself a *Bishop of Bishops,* or by a tyrannical error has forced *his colleagues* to the necessity of obedience; for every Bishop, according to the liberty and power granted unto him, is left to the exercise of his own judgment, and therefore *can neither be judged by, nor can he judge, another Bishop.* But let us all wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, *Himself alone,* has the power of committing to us the government of his Church, and of judging us for our deeds."[h] And again, in his Epistle to Antonianus, he says; "Each Bishop arranges and manages his own

[h] Superest, ut de hâc ipsâ re, quid singuli sentiamus, proferamus; neminem judicantes, aut de jure communionis, aliquem, quod diversum senserit, amoventes; neque enim quisquam nostrum, *Episcopum se esse Episcoporum* constituit; aut tyrannico errore, ad obsequendi necessitatem, *Collegas suas* adegit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus, pro licentiâ libertatis et potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium; *tamque judicari ab alio non possit cum nec ipse possit alterum judicare.* Sed expectemus universi, judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, *qui, unus et solus,* habet potestatem, et præponendi nos, in Ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi. Tractat. de Simplic. Prælat. p. 339.

business, having to give an account to the Lord."[i] Jerome too, in his Epistle to Evagrius, (and this at a time when the rights of Metropolitans had been established;) distinctly asserts the equality of all Bishops: "Wheresoever there may be a Bishop; whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria; *he has the same honour and the same Priesthood.* The abundance of riches, or the depth of poverty, does not make a Bishop either superior or inferior; but all are Successors of the Apostles."[k]

[i] Actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus.—Lib. iv. Epist. 2, p. 116.

[k] Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, &c., *ejusdem meriti ejusdem et sacerdotii.* Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt.—Par. ii. fol. 117, col. iii. "A member of the Anglican Church, ought to feel a full conviction, that the Church to which he belongs, does possess, in its regulations and its offices, 'Apostolical Succession,' in the sense in which it is essential that a Christian Community should possess it; viz.—in being a regularly-constituted Christian Society, framed in accordance with the fundamental principles taught us by the Apostles and their Great Master." "Successors, in the apostolic office, the Apostles have none. As *Witnesses* of the *Resurrection*,— as *Dispensers* of *miraculous* gifts,—as inspired *Oracles* of divine *Revelation*,—they have no successors. But as *Members*,—as *Ministers*,—as *Governors*—of Christian Communities, their successors are the regularly-admitted

The opinion of Ignatius is exactly similar; in his Epistle to the Magnesians he puts "The Bishop presiding, in the place of God; the Presbyters, in the place of the Apostolic Council:" and in his Epistle to the Church at Smyrna, he says; "Let us all follow the Bishop, as Jesus Christ did the Father; and the Presbytery as the Apostles." We have also, in these last two passages, a confirmation of the view of early Church government given above; viz. a President, or Bishop, and a Presbytery, or Council of Elders.

But although the Bishops of the Early Church were all of the same dignity and authority, and independent the one of the other; yet as guardians of the same faith, members of the same mystical body, they held communion with the Bishops of other Churches, by letters, legates, conferences; that thus, the body of the Lord might be truly one, and the unity of the Church be preserved.

Though independent, there were bonds of union between different Churches.

Several circumstances combined to keep up the union between the different Churches. 1. The Ordination of Bishops.—When the dignity of a Bishop came to exceed, by far, that of a

Members,—the lawfully-ordained Ministers,—the regular and recognised Governors,—of a regularly-subsisting Christian Church."—*Kingdom of Christ*, p. 229.

Presbyter; it seemed fit, that a Bishop should be ordained by the Bishops of the neighbouring Churches; and (just as in the Synagogue) the presence of three Bishops was necessary at the consecration.[1] 2. The Heresies that crept into the Church.—Though each Bishop, with his Presbyters, had the power of determining all religious questions; yet in general, when any serious controversy arose, the Bishops were anxious for the advice and assistance of their brethren in other Churches; and hence, the origin of Councils. 3. The Deposition of Bishops. —If any, by his doctrines or morals, had rendered himself unworthy of his bishopric; the Bishops of the neighbouring Churches assembled in council, and deposed him, as was done in the case of Paul of Samosata.[m]

From such acts of communion, there were derived, in course of time, titles and dignities

New Titles sprung up in the Christian Church.

[1] Part I. Chap. IX. p. 83. The Bishop of Alexandria was an exception, who is said to have been consecrated by his own Presbyters. Hieron. Epist. ad Evag.

[m] Eusebius, lib. vii. cap. 30. A Presbyter could be judged by his Bishop and the Presbytery; there was, however, an appeal to the Bishops of the neighbouring Churches: hence more prudent Bishops referred such cases to their Brethren; and in the African Churches there was a law, that a Presbyter should be tried by seven Bishops. Cyprian, lib. i. epist. 3, p. 10. Can. xii. Concil. Carthag. apud Beverid. p. 525.

altogether unknown in the early ages of the Church—for instance, it was necessary that some Bishop should summon the Council, that some Bishop should preside; and, as the Presidents of the Presbyteries had before this assumed to themselves authority, had taken exclusively the title of Bishop,[n] and thus came to be looked on as a distinct order from their Presbyteries; — just so, the Presidents of these Councils arrogated much to themselves, assumed a higher rank and office; and hence, the titles of Archbishop, Metropolitan, Primate, Patriarch, &c.

Origin of the names Archbishop, Metropolitan, &c.

At first the Bishops assembled in Council, either chose their President on account of his age, or else, they conceded the honour to the Bishop of the principal Church in the Province.[o] In later times this honour was universally given to the Bishop of the Metropolis; hence we find the names, *Archbishop*, *Metropolitan*, used at first at the end of the second century, becoming more common in the third.[p] When the Roman Empire became Christian, the titles of *Patriarch*, *Primate*, were introduced into the

[n] *Vide infra*, Chapter VI.

[o] This appears from the account given by Eusebius, of the Synods held to settle the controversy about Easter.

[p] See Canon vi. of Council of Nice; ix. of Antioch; and the xxxivth. Apostolic Canon.

Church. The Patriarch presided over many Provinces and many Metropolitans; the Metropolitan over one Province, but many Bishops. The dignity of Metropolitan was first confirmed at the Council of Nice; that of Patriarch, at the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon.

Church and Synagogue each passed through three different states as to government.

It appears, then, that the Church, as well as the Synagogue, passed through three states, (with respect to the mutual connexion of one Church or Synagogue with another.) While the Jewish state flourished, the authority of the Sanhedrim was supreme in all Synagogues: just so, at the first, the Presbytery at Jerusalem controlled all Christian Churches. When the Sanhedrim was dissolved,[q] all synagogues became perfectly independent of each other;[r] similarly, on the death of the Apostles, all Christian Churches were independent. And, lastly, (just as was the case with the Synagogue,) many Churches were placed under the control of one person, called a Patriarch. "This is chiefly to be observed, that this name, *Patriarch*, was

[q] The Sanhedrim was not dissolved at the destruction of Jerusalem; it continued (though with its authority greatly diminished) till about the *fifth century*.

[r] This appears from the controversy in the French Synagogues about the *More Nevochim* of Maimonides. *See* Vitringa, 868.

transferred from the Jewish Synagogue into the Christian Church; for the Jews being dispersed through all lands, after the destruction of Jerusalem, appointed to themselves at Alexandria, and at other Eastern cities, governors, whom they named *Patriarchs*."[s]

[s] Beveridge, Annot. in Can. vi. Concil. Nicæn. p. 52.

CHAPTER IV.

The Discipline of the Early Church compared with that of the Synagogue.

We have seen in a preceding Chapter,[a] that the punishments of the Synagogue were twofold: the *Anathema,* or Excommunication; and the *Perinœa, i. e.* pecuniary or corporal infliction. We will inquire, in this Chapter, how far these punishments were adopted in the early Christian Church.

Excommunication a punishment of the Christian Church,

It is evident that Excommunication was sanctioned as a punishment of the Christian Church, both by our Lord and his Apostles. "If thy brother," saith our Lord, "shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he

[a] Part I. Chap. VII.

neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."[b] Now, in this passage, there is not only a reference to excommunication as inflicted in the Synagogue, but also the adoption of it as a punishment of the Christian Church. It may be objected, that our Lord merely gives a rule as to the behaviour of one individual towards another, for he says, *Let him be to thee*, &c.; but will it be said, that when our Lord permitted an individual to act in this manner, he would deny the same liberty to his Church? However, the conduct and the injunctions of the Apostles remove all doubt as to what was the power granted to the Church.

enjoined by the Apostle Paul;

The Apostle Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, says,[c] "If any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." Here is an admonition to the whole Church of Thessalonica to avoid all intercourse with an obstinate offender, which certainly comes very near to Excommunication. In his Epistle to the Romans he says;[d] "I beseech you, brethren, mark them," which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them;" and again, in his Epistle to Titus,[e] "A man that is an heretic, after the first

[b] Matt. xviii. 15—17.
[c] Chap. iii. 14.
[d] Chap. xvi. 17.
[e] Chap. iii. 10.

and second admonition, reject." The word translated *reject*[f] is very strong; it is the word used by Greek writers when speaking of the repudiating of a wife, which consisted in exclusion from her home, and all former intercourse. It may be said that, in this latter case, the Apostle is merely advising Titus as to his own conduct; but it should be remembered that, according to the Jewish constitutions, an individual excommunicated by the President was looked upon as excommunicated by the whole Church; and Titus was the Bishop or President of the Church at Crete.

enforced by the same Apostle:

But the Apostle Paul has reduced his principles to practice, in the case of an unworthy member of the Church at Corinth. A member of this Church had been guilty of a grievous crime, the marrying his father's wife; the Corinthians took no notice, but allowed the offender to continue in the full enjoyment of the privileges of the Church. The Apostle, burning with indignation, severely rebukes the Corinthians, because "they had not mourned, and removed him from amongst them, who had done this deed;"[g] and commands them, "Put away from among yourselves[h] that wicked person." The severity of the intended excommunication may be learned from the eleventh

[f] Παραιτοῦ. [g] 1 Cor. v. 2. [h] Verse 13.

verse; "I have written unto you not to keep company; if any man, that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no, not to eat." The Corinthians obeyed the Apostle's command, and excommunicated the offending brother. We learn in the Second Epistle how they acted towards him:[i] they publicly reproved him, separated him from their society, and brought him to a state of the most intense grief and anguish. Here, then, is an instance of excommunication in the Early Church; a total separation from all communion with the Brethren.

mentioned by St. John;

We learn from the Epistles of St. John, that excommunication was sanctioned by him. "If," he says, "there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds;"[k] and that it was a punishment inflicted in his days, appears from his Third Epistle, in which the ambition and malevolence of Diotrephes is rebuked;—"He doth not receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and *casteth them out of the Church.*"[l]

[i] 2 Cor. ii. 5—10.

[k] Second Epistle, verse 10, 11.

[l] Verse 10.

And as this punishment was both sanctioned and inflicted in the Apostles' times, so it was afterwards continued: and hence, we frequently meet (in the Fathers) with the phrases *Arceri*, or *ejici ab Ecclesiâ*, or *a paternitatis communione relegari, submoveri a limine et omni tecto Ecclesiæ, sacramento benedictionis exauctorari.*[m]

continued to be inflicted as a punishment in after-ages.

At first, Excommunication consisted in an entire separation from the Church, and, of course, in an exclusion from the place of worship. In process of time, the Church (just as the Synagogue) had its heavier and its lighter excommunication; in cases of lesser crimes, permitting the guilty person to have access to the place of worship, but denying him a participation of the Lord's Supper.

It will be easy to trace many points of agreement between Excommunication, as inflicted, in the Church and in the Synagogue. In both, there was the heavier and the lighter; in both, the punishment was inflicted for similar crimes; not so much for offences against morals, as for

Analogy between Excommunication as inflicted in the Church and in the Synagogue.

[m] "Ibidem exhortationes, castigationes, et censura divina; nam et judicatur magno cum pondere, ut apud certos de Dei conspectu; summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a *communicatione orationis et conventus et omnis sancti commercii relegetur.*"—*Tertullian, Apol.* cap. 39.

those against the dignity, the authority, and the doctrines of the Church. The horrible imprecations of the Jewish anathema bear a striking resemblance to those of the Christian, (especially to those used by the Church of Rome;) the forms of absolution were very similar:— and, lastly, as in the Synagogue, the power of excommunicating lay with the Council, and sometimes with the President; so in the Church, this power was (from the earliest times) vested in the Council of Bishops and Presbyters, though sometimes it was exercised by the Bishops.

No analogy between the Church and the Synagogue as to the other punishments of the latter.

With respect to the other punishments of the Synagogue; viz. Flagellation and the Pecuniary Fine, there is nothing at all analogous in the Christian Church. It is recorded, indeed, that our Lord made a scourge of small cords, and drove the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, and this on two different occasions;[n] but this was rather an evidence of his zeal and a symbolical action,[o] than an example to be imitated. On the contrary, Corporal punishment was strictly forbidden in the Christian Church, especially

[n] John ii. 15; Matt. xxi. 12.

[o] See a Sermon preached by Bishop Hurd at Lincoln's Inn, in which he shows, that the driving the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, was an act symbolical of the calling of the Gentiles.

in those cases, in which it was most usually inflicted in the Synagogue; viz. the case of an offending Doctor or Student. [p]

[p] "Neminem quisquam peccantem clericum cæde attingat, non Presbyter, non Diaconus, non Episcopus, clericum vel servitorem ad cædem perducat; sed si ita causa exigit clerici, triduo privetur honore, ut penitus redeat ad Matrem Ecclesiam."—*Decret.* Par. I. Dist. 45, Can. 17.

CHAPTER V.

Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue, as to the Collection and Distribution of Alms.

Much Almsgiving in the Early Church.

In the primitive Christian Church, as love abounded, so great attention was paid to the wants of the poor brethren. At first, all things were common, "and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need."[a] And though this community of goods did not long continue, yet Christian charity was not extinguished; hence, we have in the writings of the Apostles, not only many exhortations to be liberal to the poor, especially to those that are of the household of faith; but also accounts of collections that were made and sent to the distressed brethren. In later times, this love to the brethren, and to all, for Christ's sake, still continued to be the distinguishing trait of Christ's disciples, so much so

[a] Acts iv. 34, 35.

as to force the apostate Julian to declare, in a letter to Arsacius the priest of Galatia; "It is a disgrace to us that the Jews do not beg; that the impious Galilæans not only support their own poor, but assist ours; and that our poor are neglected by those who should support them."[b]

Analogy between the Alms of the Church and the Synagogue.

We may trace the following points of agreement between the Church and the Synagogue, as to the collection and distribution of Alms. In the Synagogue, Alms were collected for a twofold purpose; for the poor Members of the Congregation, and for the poor brethren in Judæa.[c] The same custom prevailed in the early Christian Church.[d] In the Synagogue, the Alms, though set apart on the Sabbath, were not paid in till the first day of the week;[e] in the Church also, the Collection was made on the first day of the week.[f] In the Synagogue, the distribution of Alms lay with the President; in the Church it lay with the Bishop; "The rich, and every one that wishes, contributes just what seems fit; and what is

[b] Sozomen. Eccles. Hist. Book v. Chap. 16.

[c] Part I. Chap. VIII. page 73.

[d] 2 Cor. chap. viii. and ix.; *vide* also testimony of Jerome, quoted page 74.

[e] Part I. Chap. VIII. page 75.

[f] 1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3.

thus collected is deposited with the President or Bishop, who relieves orphans, and widows, and those who are in need, through disease, or any other cause; those who are in bonds, and strangers: in a word, he has the relieving of all the indigent."[g]

[g] Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, p. 33.

CHAPTER VI.

The Presbyters of the Church, compared with those of the Synagogue.

1. In the times of the Apostles, the power of selecting and ordaining Presbyters rested with the Apostles themselves, or their deputies; "Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders (*Presbyters*) in every Church."[a] Timothy and Titus were the deputies[b] of the Apostle Paul, and as such the Apostle enjoins the former to "lay hands suddenly on no man;"[c] and reminds the latter how that he left him in Crete "to ordain *Elders* in every city."[d] 1. Election of Presbyters.

In fact, the Apostles being the ambassadors[e] of Jesus Christ, commissioned by him with full authority to found his Church, having the gift of The Apostles had absolute power in the selection of Ministers.

[a] Acts xiv. 23.

[b] *i. e.* Deputed by the Apostle to hold a certain authority in certain Churches; the Apostle, however, did not give up his right (as an Apostle) to the absolute control of these Churches. *Vide* Appendix, note (L.)

[c] 1 Tim. v. 22. [d] Titus i. 5.

[e] The Apostles, are strictly speaking, the only ambassadors of Christ. That the Saviour's declaration, "As my Father

the Holy Ghost and the power to communicate it, neither would nor could resign their commission to another; much less would they suffer their voice or that of their deputies (who had received the Holy Ghost from them,) to be overruled by popular opinion in the selection of Ministers. In the Apostolic times, then, the Pastors of the Church were ordained independently of the people. We may be sure, however, that the Apostles exercised this authority with the greatest mildness, and with every wish to yield, as far as possible, to the wishes of the Church: hence we find, that they entrusted altogether to the Church the selection of the temporary officers mentioned in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, reserving to themselves the approval of the selection.[f]

In the times succeeding the Apostolic, the people were always consulted in the selection

hath sent me, even so send I you," John xx. 21, is applicable to the Apostles alone, is evident from a comparison of this passage with chap. xvii. 18, and 20.

[f] Tertullian makes this appointment of Pastors independently of the people a peculiar trait of Apostolic times. "Primævæ Ecclesiæ Episcopos, ipsos Apostolos auctores habuisse; hoc enim modo, Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia Polycarpum ab Johanne collocatum refert; sicut Romanorum, Clementem a Petro ordinatum; id et proinde utique et ceteræ exhibuit quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habeant." —*Adv. Hær.* cap. 32.

of Ministers. First, with respect to Bishops; Cyprian, in his letter to Antonianus, writes thus in reference to the Election of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome. "For that which commends our most beloved Cornelius to God, and to Christ, and to his Church, and to all his brethren in the Priesthood is; that he did not come to his Bishopric suddenly, but he passed through all the different orders of the Church, ... and *he was made Bishop by very many of our colleagues* who were then at Rome, who sent to us, in reference to his Ordination, the highest testimonials in his praise. He was made, then, Bishop, by the will of God and of his Christ, by the *testimony of almost all the Clergy, by the suffrages of the People,* who were then present."[g] We learn from this passage, that Cornelius was elected to his Bishopric by the Bishops, but that his Election was confirmed by the suffrages of the People. In another Epistle he says; "The Ordination of Priests ought not to take place, but with the approval of the People: that, by their presence, either the crimes of bad men may be detected, or the merits of good men be proclaimed; and *let that be a just and legitimate Ordination, which shall have been determined on by the suffrages and judgment of all.*"[h] Eusebius gives similar

In the times succeeding the Apostles, opinion of the people consulted in the election of Bishops;

[g] Epist. lib. iv. sec. 2.

[h] Lib. i. Epist. 4.

testimony; speaking of the Election of Fabian, Bishop of Rome; he says, "That all the People, who had assembled at the Election, cried out, that he was worthy."[i] In a letter from a council held at Nice, to the Church of Alexandria, it is enjoined; "That no one be chosen into the room of any Bishop deceased, unless he appear worthy, and *the People elect him;* the Bishop of the city of Alexandria giving his approval, and confirming the judgment of the People."[k]

as also in the appointment of Presbyters.

With respect to the appointment of Presbyters, &c., though the consent of the people was not absolutely necessary, yet no Bishop of good repute would appoint one, contrary to the expressed wish of the People. "In ordaining Clergymen, beloved brethren, we are accustomed first to consult you, and to consider with you the merits and deserts of each."[l]

Agreement between the Church and the Synagogue in the election and ordination of Ministers.

We can trace, in the Ordination and Election of the Ministers of the Christian Church, an agreement with the Synagogue. In both cases, the Ordination was by imposition of hands.[m] If in the Synagogue, the Election of the President depended upon the suffrages of the people, it was just similar in the Election of a Bishop: the

[i] Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. cap. 29.
[k] Theodor. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 6.
[l] Cyprian, Epist. v. lib. 2.
[m] 1 Tim. v. 22. 2 Tim. i. 6.

President of the Synagogue was of the same order as his Presbyters; the Bishop (as we will endeavour to show) was of the same order as his Presbyters: at the Ordination of the President of a Synagogue, there were always three Presbyters present to lay on hands; the Canons of the Early Church required three Bishops to be present at the Consecration of a Bishop.

Lastly, as in the Synagogue, Ordination was sometimes conferred as an honour, and was not the setting apart to an office; so also, in after times, in the Christian Church, the names Doctor, Presbyter, were mere titles of dignity or honour, conferring as it were a faculty to teach and administer the Sacraments, rather than signifying the actual performance of these offices.

Number of Presbyters.

2. Neither in the writings of the New Testament, nor in the Canons of the Ancient Church, is there any mention of a fixed number of Presbyters; indeed, it is most likely that at first the number was determined by the necessities of the Church, and that they were ordained according as there was a demand. In course of time, Ordination was conferred as a mark of favour, and hence in some Churches the number of Presbyters was very great; Jerome, speaking of this says; "The smallness of their number makes the

Deacons honourable, the crowd of Presbyters makes them contemptible."[n] Eusebius informs us, that about the middle of the third century, there were in the Church of Rome forty-six Presbyters, and but seven Deacons.[o] And so far did the abuse proceed that the Emperor Justinian found it necessary to limit the number of Presbyters, permitting no more than sixty to be ordained for the Church of Constantinople.[p]

Stipend of Presbyters;

3. The principle, that "they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel,"[q] is one acknowledged by our Lord, and acted on by both himself and his disciples. Thus, when first he sent forth his Apostles to preach the glad tidings of the kingdom, he bade them freely to enter every house, and if received, to abide there, and eat such things as were set before them; "for the labourer is worthy of his hire."[r] Acting on this principle, the Early Christians supported by free gifts the Apostles and teachers of the truth, and St. Paul gave directions to the Churches to which he addressed his Epistles, to maintain those who laboured amongst them; and when in the case of this Apostle, the principle seemed

[n] Epist. ad Evag. tom. ii. p. 117.
[o] Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 13.
[p] Nov. iii. *Vide* Tigl. ad Diac. cap. 5.
[q] 1 Cor. ix. 14. [r] Matt. x. 10, 11.

to be called in question, he strongly asserted his right to be supported and sustained by those amongst whom he laboured.[s]

The stipend paid to the clergy of the Early Church was at first from voluntary contributions, which were collected at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This sacrament was in general preceded by a feast,[t] at which every believer, according to his ability, offered a gift; and when the expense of the table had been defrayed, the President or Bishop laid aside a portion of the offerings for himself, the Presbyters, and Deacons; and with the residue relieved widows, and orphans, and confessors, and the poor not only of his own Church, but also of the Jews and Gentiles.[u] The stipend was apportioned to the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, according to the dignity and merits of each.[x] In process of

At first voluntary contribution.

[s] 1 Cor. ix. 5, &c. Gal. iv. 6. Phil. iv. 16, 17, 18. Acts xviii. 3; xx. 33, 34.

[t] 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21.

[u] "Modicam unusquisque stipem, menstruâ die, vel cum velit, et si modo velit et si modo possit, apponit, nam nemo compellitur, sed suâ sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt; nam inde non epulis, non potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur; sed egenis alendis humandisque, et pueris ac puellis re et parentibus destitutis, itemque domesticis, senibus, naufragis, et si qui in metallis, vel insulis, vel custodiis, Christianæ confessionis sint alumni."—*Tertull. Apol.* cap. 39.

[x] Cyprian. lib. iv. epist. 6.

time, (just as in the Synagogue,) the first-fruits, and then the tenths, were given by the laity, as appears from the Apostolic Canons and Constitutions. In the second and third centuries, large sums of money were left to the Church; it thus became possessed of property, which was secured to it as a body by an edict of Constantine; "And since these same Christians are known to have in their possession, not only those places in which they are accustomed to assemble, but others also, not the property of individuals, but belonging to the Church as a body; we vest all such by Law, without any ambiguity or controversy, in the said Christians as a body."

CHAPTER VII.

Orders of Ministers in the Early Church.

We mentioned in a preceding Chapter,[a] that the Presbyters of each Church constituted a certain body or College, which managed the affairs of the Church; that each College (called a *Presbytery)* had its President, who summoned and dismissed the assembly, put questions to the vote, summed up the opinions, and pronounced the decision of the body. In the course of time, these Presidents, acquiring much authority, assumed to themselves exclusively the title of Bishops; so that at length they seemed to differ from the other Presbyters, not only in rank, but also in order and office.

Presidents of the Presbyteries of the Church assumed to themselves exclusively the title of Bishops.

This view of the case is absolutely necessary, in order to reconcile Ecclesiastical history with Scripture. If it be said, that there were, in the Early Church, Bishops with Apostolic ordination, differing in order from Presbyters, how

This supposition the only way of reconciling Ecclesiastical history with Scripture.

[a] Part II. Chap. III.

can it be accounted for, that Bishops and Presbyters never appear in the writings of the New Testament, as distinct orders, but the government of the Church is always assigned to Bishops, Presbyters, Pastors, terms used indifferently for each other, without any mark of distinction ?[b] But if, on the other hand, it be said, that the Presbyters of the Apostolic age were all of equal rank and dignity; it will be impossible to account, how it came to pass, that in so short a time after the death of the Apostles, there was so great a difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter; so much so, that the Episcopal succession in some Churches (from their very origin) has been handed down as matter of history.[c] Our position, which is the middle between extremes, and is supported by the analogy of the Synagogue, removes the difficulties urged with so much speciousness on both sides;[d] for, as the Presidents of the Chris-

[b] Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2; Titus i. 5, 6, 7, where the Bishop, in the 7th verse, is evidently the same as the Elder in the 5th.

[c] "Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsidentur, apud quas authenticæ eorum literæ recitantur, sonantes vocem, repræsentantes faciem."—*Tertullian. adv. Hæret.* p. 126.

[d] "Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church, presently after the Apostles' times. Between the Apostles' times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an

tian Churches held the same rank and office as the Presbyters, there was no necessity (in the Apostles' times) to distinguish the Bishop from the Presbyter; and, again, as these Presidents were chosen (probably) on account of their great age, or superior acquirements, and hence their opinions and authority had much weight, we need not wonder that, in a short time, their dignity surpassed that of the other Presbyters, and that *Bishop* became their distinguishing title.

Argument of those who contend for a threefold order in the times of the Apostles.

They who contend for a threefold order in the times of the Apostles, allow, that in the New Testament the Clergy are divided into Presbyters and Deacons; but they deny that it follows from this, that there were but two orders.[c] The Jewish High Priest (they say) was of the order of Priests, and yet had an order peculiar to himself; so the Bishop of a Christian Church may be of the order of Presbyters, and yet have an order peculiar to himself.

Analogy contended for untenable.

But the analogy here contended for (though sanctioned by ancient writers) is untenable for two reasons. First. The difference between the High Priest and the other Priests, is not at all analogous to the difference between a Bishop

alteration:—and, therefore, there was no such alteration as is pretended. And, therefore episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be apostolic: *Quod erat demonstrandum.*"—*Chillingworth.*

[c] Dodwell, Dissertationes Cypr. de Ordin. Episcop. sec. 5, 6.

and a Presbyter. There was truly a notable difference between the High Priest and the common Priests; he was consecrated to his office by peculiar ceremonies, appeared in a peculiar dress, had peculiar duties assigned to him, and could determine about the sacred things of the Temple, without consulting the other Priests, (who were all subject to him.) Now, what is there, in the peculiar duties and peculiar powers of the High Priest, at all analogous to the peculiar duties and powers of a Bishop, even at the time when Episcopal dignity had reached its summit? Jerome says, in his Epistle to Evagrius, that the power of ordaining constituted the sole difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter.[f] A Bishop of olden times would not transact any business of importance, without the advice of his Presbyters. Thus Cyprian, in one of his letters; "As to the subject respecting which, our *Brother-Presbyters*, Donatus and Novatus and Cordius have written to me; *I of myself could give no answer*, since from the very beginning of my Episcopacy, I have resolved to do nothing without your advice and the consent of my people."[g] How different from the powers, the independence of the High Priest.

[f] "Exceptâ ordinatione, quid facit Episcopus, quod Presbyter non facit?"

[g] Lib. iii. Epist. 10.

But, Secondly. The Analogy is untenable, because the Apostles had not the Temple in view, when arranging and ordering the Church. Christian places of worship are nowhere by them called *Temples;* they do not style the Presbyters, *Priests* (hiereis),[h] nor the Deacons, *Levites*, nor the Lord's table, *an Altar*, nor the Bread and Wine, *a Sacrifice.* No; taught by the Holy Spirit, that the ceremonies of the Law had been abolished through Christ, they seem anxiously to have taken care, lest there should be even a similarity of names, in the rites and offices of the Christian Church. The Analogy, between Priests and Presbyters, &c., was an invention of after-times, when the Rulers of the Church assumed to themselves extravagant powers; and it is a remarkable fact, that

The Apostles had not the Temple in view when ordering and arranging the Church.

[h] "It is well known, that certain ministers of religion were ordained by Christ and his Apostles, and have continued in an unbroken succession down to the present day: and it is not to be wondered at, that the *name* "Priest" should be applied in common to these and to the *Ministers* of every other religion, true or false: but the point to be observed is, that their office is essentially and fundamentally different. When the title is applied, for instance, to a Jewish Priest, and to a Christian, it is applied equivocally; not to denote two different *kinds* of priests, but in two different senses; the essential circumstances which *constitute* the priestly office in the one, being wanting in the other. Accordingly, there are in Greek, as is well known, two words, totally unconnected in etymology, which are used to denote the two offices respectively;—the

the title of *Chief Priest* was renounced by the Bishops of the principal Church in Africa, after that experience had taught them, that some Bishops used it to suit their own ambitious views; the twenty-ninth Canon of the third Council of Carthage decreed; "That the Bishop of the principal Church should not be called *Chief Priest,* nor *High Priest,* nor by any name of the kind, but only *Bishop of the principal Church.*"

Orders in the Early Church determined from the Analogy of the Synagogue.

But the fact, that the Early Christian Church was modelled after the Synagogue, will help us much to determine the question, and upon examination, we shall find that the analogy is in this case most complete. Thus, the Synagogue had its Presbytery; so had the Church, and the

Jewish priest, and also that of the Pagan religions, being invariably called HIEREUS; the Christian priest, EPISCOPOS, or oftener, PRESBYTEROS, from which last our English word 'Priest' is manifestly formed. It is remarkable, however, that it is never rendered 'Priest' in our version of the Bible, but always according to its etymology, 'Elder;' and that wherever the word Priest occurs, it is always used to correspond to *Hiereus.* This last title is applied frequently to Jesus Christ himself, but never to any other character under the Gospel-dispensation. This circumstance alone would render it highly probable, that Christ and his Apostles did not intend to institute in the Christian Church any office corresponding to that of Priest in the Jewish: otherwise they would, doubtless, have designated it by a name so familiarly known."—*Archbishop Whately's Essays;* vide *Appendix, On the Absence of a Priesthood.*

names given to the members of these different Presbyteries were identically the same: the Jewish Presbyteries had each their President, who was the only person that could ordain; the Christian Presbyteries had also their President, (called, in after-times, peculiarly the Bishop,) upon whom alone was conferred the power of ordaining. The Presidents of the Synagogue, though differing in rank and power from the members of the Presbytery, were still of the same order; it is not probable that it was dissimilar in the Christian Church; if the power of ordaining, vested in the President of the Synagogue, did not create in him a distinct order; why should the same power, when conferred upon the Bishop of a Christian Church, make his order different from that of his colleagues? In each case, the President, when ordaining, acted as the representative, and in the name of the whole Presbytery.[1]

The Controversy a mere verbal one.

After all, there is not so much difference between the contending parties in this controversy as at first sight appears: thus Dodwell, in his Dissertations, says; "Blondell concedes to us that the Bishop had the power of summoning and dismissing the Councils, which alone is suf-

[1] At the ordination of Priests in the Anglican Church, it is necessary that the Priests present lay on hands, as well as the Bishop.—*Vide Ordination Service.*

ficient for our purpose," (*i.e.* to prove a difference of orders;) and in another place, he acknowledges, that the Bishops of the Apostolic age were the *Presidents of the Presbyteries.*[k] If this be so, is not the whole controversy a verbal one (about the meaning of the word *order?*) and is it worth the discussion and labour that has been bestowed, to determine whether the dignity of perpetual Presidentship confers a distinct order?[1]

[k] We have a remnant of these Presbyteries in the Chapters of our Cathedrals, which were at first courts (as it were) attendant on the Bishop, residing near his person, and counselling him in all matters pertaining to the administration of his diocese; the members are called *Prebendaries*, from *præbeo*, because it was their business to *afford* or *give* their advice.—*Gibson*, 172.

[1] "To this kind of Government (viz. the Episcopal), I am not, by any particular interest, so devoted, as to think it ought to be maintained, either in opposition to Apostolic institution, or to the much desired reformation of men's lives, and restoration of primitive discipline, or to any law or precept of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for that were to maintain a means contrary to the end; for obedience to our Saviour is the end for which Church-government is appointed. But if it may be demonstrated, (or made much more probable than the contrary,) as I verily think it may:—1. That it is not repugnant to the government settled in and for the Church by the Apostles:—2. That it is as compliable with the reformation of any evil, which we desire to reform, either in Church or State, or the introduction of any good, which we desire to introduce, as any kind of government:—and 3. That there is no law, no record of our Saviour against it: then, I hope, it

will not be thought an unreasonable motion, if we humbly desire those that are in authority, especially the high court of parliament, that it may not be sacrificed to clamour, or overborne by violence: and though (which God forbid) the greater part of the multitude should cry, Crucify, Crucify, yet our governors would be so full of justice and courage, as not to give it up, until they perfectly understand concerning Episcopacy itself, 'What evil hath it done.'"—*Chillingworth.*—*Vide* Appendix, Note (L.)

CHAPTER VIII.

The Deacons of the Church compared with those of the Synagogue.

Analogy between the Chazzans and the Deacons.

WHEN instituting a comparison between the Church and the Synagogue, we shall probably find, in no instance, a more striking agreement, than between the Deacons of the former, and the Chazzans of the latter. This agreement appears in the names and offices of each. First,

As to names.

in the names; the Hebrew word *Chazzan*, answers to the Greek word ὑπηρέτης, and the Chazzans of the Synagogue are thus designated in the New Testament:[a] the word Deacon[b] answers to the very same word,[c] and the Deacons

[a] Matt. v. 25; xxvi. 58; John vii. 32.

[b] The word διακονεῖν, generally signifies to *wait at table*, John ii. 5; Luke xvii. 7; and as the most important business of the Deacon was to assist at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, this may have been the reason why he was usually styled διάκονος rather than ὑπηρέτης.

[c] 1 Tim. iv. 6; 1 Cor. iv. 1; Col. i. 23; Luke i. 2; Philemon 13.

of the primitive Church are thus styled in the 25th Canon of the Council of Laodicea, and in the Canons of the Council of Nice.

Again, there is an agreement (as far as we can fairly expect an agreement) in their offices. It was the duty of the Deacons to read the Scriptures in the Church, to see that the Congregation was attentive,[d] to instruct the Catechumens in the truths of the Christian religion,[e] to give the signal when the different parts of the service commenced.[f] As the Chazzans covered and uncovered the Ark, so the Deacons settled the Communion-table, and put on its covering; in a word, as Isidore describes their office; "It pertains to the Deacon to assist the Priests, and to minister at all the Sacraments of Christ, at Baptism, the Chrism, the giving of the Bread and Wine; to receive oblations, and to place them upon the altar; to settle the Lord's table and to cover it; to carry the cross; to preach the Gospel and the Apostles . . . . . to him also pertains the reciting the prayers, the calling out the names; he exhorts the congregation to be attentive." These points of agreement are so

As to offices.

[d] The Deacon stands and says with a loud voice, Attend!—*Chrysostom, 19th Homily on the Acts.*

[e] The Deacons purify by instruction and doctrine.—*Theophylact on the* xix*th of Luke.*

[f] Balsaman ad Can. 22. Conc. Laod.

numerous and so striking, as to leave but little doubt, that the Deacon of the Church is the successor of the Chazzan of the Synagogue.[g]

Objection.

But it may be objected, is there not express mention of the institution of the order, in the Acts of the Apostles?[h] and in the account there given, there is no reference to the Synagogue. Again, is not the voice of the Church against our position? the Fathers universally looking upon those *seven*, mentioned in the sixth of Acts, as the first Deacons of the Christian Church. But,

The seven officers mentioned in the sixth of Acts, not Deacons.

1. The seven officers, whose appointment is recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts, were quite distinct from the Deacons of the Church: they were appointed upon a particular occasion, for a particular purpose; viz. to distribute alms. Now the care of the poor, and the distribution of alms, did not lie with the Deacons of the primitive Church, but with the Bishops and

[g] "Horum (says Grotius, speaking of the Chazzans) munus inter cetera erat, Legis librum custodire, atque etiam si opus esset, ex eo legere, quod in Ecclesiâ Christianâ faciebant ἀναγνωσταὶ, quæ erat species διακόνων, nam olim cum exigua esset multitudo, iidem Diaconi omnia ea obibant, quæ Presbyteris obire non vacabat. Postea distributi sunt labores, et facti sunt alii διάκονοι, alii ἀρχιδιάκονοι, alii ὑποδιάκονοι, alii Janitores, alii Acoluthi Episcoporum, alii ἀναγνωσταὶ, alii ψαλμῳδοὶ; etiam Hieronymus lectitare in Ecclesiâ ait Diaconorum." —*Annot. in Luc.* iv. 20.

[h] Chap. vi.

Presbyters; thus Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, exhorts the Presbyters: "Let the Presbyters be ready to commiserate, merciful to all, bringing back those who have erred, visiting all the infirm, not neglecting the widow, the orphan or the poor; but always providing what is good in the sight of God and man."[i] From the New Testament too, it is evident, that the distribution of alms was not the peculiar office of the Deacon. The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, speaks of the qualifications of a Deacon; there is not one word about the distribution of alms, not a qualification mentioned that has the least reference to it; how account for this silence, if the distribution of alms was the Deacon's first, his most important duty? Again, we read in the Epistles,[k] that collections were made in different Churches for the poor saints at Jerusalem: but there is no mention of the collection having been made by the Deacons, (though doubtless there were Deacons in those Churches;) on the contrary, the Apostle advises each Christian, himself to set apart, on every Lord's day, a sum of money, which was to be handed over to the Apostle or to some one deputed by him. If the Deacons were the collec-

[i] Edit. Cl. Monach. p. 7.

[k] Rom. xv. 25. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 1.

tors and distributors of alms, why was not the duty assigned to them? But further, the seven officers appointed in the Church of Jerusalem are nowhere called Deacons;[1] Stephen is nowhere called a Deacon; the name of Philip frequently occurs in the Acts of the Apostles—he is never called a Deacon; and in one place where there is a reference to his appointment, he is styled, *not one of the seven Deacons*, but *one of the seven*.[m] These seven officers were appointed for a special purpose; a dispute having arisen between the Hellenists and Hebrews, about their widows, seven men were appointed from the former, (it appears from their names that they were all Greeks,) to look after their own widows:[n] the office continued but for a time,

[1] It may be said that the name is implied, as they were appointed "to serve (διακονεῖν) tables," but it should be remembered that the opposition is not in the word διακονεῖν, but between the ministering *the word* and the ministering *to tables*.

[m] Acts xxi. 8.

[n] Even granting these seven to have been Deacons, the institution of the order could not have been in consequence of this murmuring of the Hellenists; for evidently, before this, "some dispensers there must have been, and if so, either the Apostles must have officiated as Deacons, or special Deacons there must have been, by whatever name they went. That the Apostles did not officiate, is plain from the tenor of the narrative, which indicates that the appeal was made to them, and that they excused themselves from presiding personally at the "ministration," (as was probably desired by the dis-

and hence we read of Philip leaving Jerusalem, preaching the Gospel in Samaria, and afterwards dwelling at Cesaræa.[o]

2. The voice of the ancient Church is not opposed to this opinion; Cyprian indeed says, "Deacons ought to remember, that the Lord chose the Apostles, *i. e.* the Bishops and Presidents of his Church; but after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, the Apostles appointed Deacons, to be Ministers of the Bishops and of the Church."[p] It is true that a Synod at Neocesaræa decreed, in its fifteenth Canon, that no matter how large the city, there should be but seven Deacons in the Church; as that was the number appointed by the Apostles to the Church of Jerusalem. But then, on the other hand, a

contented party,) alleging that it was incompatible with their proper duties. "It is not reason that we should *leave the word of God*, and serve tables." This very assertion, then, is proof certain that they did not officiate. Again, on reading over the names of the seven deacons, we find them all of the Grecian or Hellenistic party. Stephen, Philip, Procorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas, the last of whom is expressly described as a proselyte of Antioch. Now this surely would have produced a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had already some in office interested in looking after their rights. With these presumptions in favour of a previous appointment of deacons, it would seem then, that these seven were added to the former number because of the complaint."—*Hinds's Rise and Early Progress of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 217.

[o] Acts viii. 5; xxi. 8.

[p] Epist. lib. iii. Epist. 9.

Synod at Constantinople, building upon the authority of Chrysostom,[q] decreed that the seven appointed in the Apostles' times, were not of the same order as the Deacons of the Church. In fact, the difference between the two classes of officers is so marked, that some writers, still anxious to deduce from the Acts of the Apostles, the origin of the office of Deacon, are yet forced to acknowledge, that, in time, the duties of the Deacons became quite different from those for which they were originally appointed.

Number of Deacons.

It is not easy to determine what was the number of Deacons in the Early Churches; but that a Church might have more than one appears from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, which is addressed to the "Saints in Christ Jesus, who are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons."[r] It is probable, that at first the number was determined by the wants of each Church; until some Churches, supposing that the institution of the office was to be found in the sixth of Acts, limited the number to seven; hence the Canon of the Synod of Neocesaræa, quoted above. The Church of Rome most religiously observed this number, whilst other Churches appointed Dea-

[q] Synod. Œcumen. Quinti Sext. Canon 16, apud Beverig. tom. i. p. 174.

[r] Chap. 1. There was then more than one *Bishop*, i. e. *Presbyter*, in the church at Philippi.

cons according to their necessities. "Amongst the Romans there are not to this day more than seven Deacons, after the example of those who were at first ordained by the Apostles, amongst whom was Stephen the first Martyr; but in other Churches the number of Deacons is not thus limited."[s]

Appointment of Deacons.

With respect to the appointment of Deacons, the Church was circumstanced very much like the Synagogue. As long as the Apostles presided over the Church at Jerusalem, they had the power of ordaining whom they would, as Presbyters and Deacons; but after their death, and the consequent abolition of the supremacy of the Church at Jerusalem, the Deacons were chosen by the voice of the people; and although some Bishops asserted to themselves the right of selecting the Presbyters and Deacons, religious Bishops never departed from the old custom of consulting the people.[t]

The Bishop the Angel or Legate of the Christian Church.

It has been mentioned in a former Chapter,[u] that the Chazzan sometimes fulfilled the office of Legate of the Church, though the President of the Synagogue was *ex officio* the Legate. In the Christian Church, the chief minister was always the Legate; it was he that invariably

[s] Sozomen, Eccles. Hist., book vii. chap. 19.

[t] Cyprian, Epist., book ii. epist. 5.

[u] Part I. Chap. X. p. 89.

addressed Jehovah in prayer in behalf of the people: hence the Apostle John, writing to the seven Churches in Asia, styles their Bishop, or President, *the Angel, i.e.* the Legate of the Church: this word designating the Bishop's most solemn, most important duty, viz. to offer up prayers in the congregation.

CHAPTER IX.

The Discourses delivered in the Early Christian Church compared with those delivered in the Synagogue.

On comparing the discourses delivered in the Early Church with those delivered in the Synagogue, we shall find an analogy in the following respects. Analogy between the Discourses of the Synagogue and those of the Church.

1. The name given to the discourses delivered in the Synagogue was Daraschoth; the corresponding Greek word is applied, all through the Acts of the Apostles,[a] to the discourses of the Christian Church. In names.

2. In the Synagogue, a portion of the Law or of the Prophets was read before the exhortation; it was similar in the Early Church; "On the day which is called Sunday, all who live either in the towns or in the country, meet together, and the writings of the Apostles or In manner.

[a] Acts xvii. 2, 18; xviii. 4, 19; xix. 8, 9; xx. 7.

those of the Prophets are read for a certain time; then, the reader having finished, the President[b] delivers a discourse, in which he instructs the people, and exhorts them to virtue; after this we all stand up and pray; and prayer being ended, there is offered bread and wine and water; the President likewise, according to his ability, offers up prayer and thanksgiving, and the people solemnly assent by saying, Amen."[c]

In style. 3. The discourses delivered in the Synagogue were highly allegorical; so likewise were those in the Early Church. Those of our Lord were evidently so; the Epistles of the Apostle Paul prove, that this mode of explaining divine truth was not laid aside by his Apostles; whilst the Epistle of Barnabas, abounding as it does with allegories, gives a fair specimen of the writing, and of course the preaching, usual in these times; and though, in all probability, Barnabas was not the author of the Epistle, still it is a venerable monument of Christian antiquity; and we may fairly consider it as a model of ancient writing, and (if men preached as they wrote) of ancient preaching.

As to place. 4. In the Synagogue, the sermons were preached from a pulpit; it was the same in the

[b] προεστὼς, a name derived, without doubt, from the Synagogue.

[c] Justin Martyr, Apol. ii. pp. 97, 98.

Church; there is frequent mention of the pulpit in the Greek and Latin Fathers.

As to time.

5. Sermons were usually preached in the Synagogue on the Sabbath-day; Justin Martyr, in the passage above quoted, shows that in the Church sermons were usually delivered on the Lord's day. And, as in the Synagogue, there was sometimes great neglect of this duty of exhorting the people; so there was also in the Church,—so much so, that Sozomen complains, that in the Church of Rome, in his time, there were no sermons at all; "neither the Bishop, nor any one else, teaches in the Church."[d]

As to the persons permitted to preach.

6. With respect to the persons permitted to preach, there is a remarkable analogy between the Church and the Synagogue. The Ruler of the Synagogue had the exclusive right of preaching, but he could call upon any Doctor or Rabbi, nay, even upon a layman of known talent and piety. A similar liberty was granted in the Christian Church. It was the undoubted right and duty of the Bishops and Presbyters to preach;[e] but sometimes Deacons, and even laymen, were permitted to address the people. With respect to Deacons, the fact appears from sermons that have been handed down to us, of Chrysostom, while he was as yet a Deacon, and

[d] Sozomen, Eccl. Hist., Book vii. cap. 39.

[e] 1 Tim. iii. 2; iv. 6. 2 Tim. iv. 2.

of Ephraim Syrus, the Deacon. With respect to laymen, we have the testimony of Eusebius;[f] he mentions, how that Origen was asked by the Bishops of Palestine, to preach publicly in the Church, and to expound the Sacred Scriptures; this was objected to, as contrary to custom, and to the order which ought to be observed in Church matters; upon which, Alexander Bishop of Jerusalem, and Theodistus Bishop of Cesaræa, in a letter to Demetrius, defended themselves as follows: "As to what you have urged in your letter, that it was never before known, nor ever yet has happened, that, in the presence of Bishops, a layman should preach; in that you are much mistaken; for if, at any time, there are present those who can profit their brethren, the Bishops, of their own accord, exhort such to speak to the people: thus Evelpis Larandis was asked by Neon, Paulinus of Iconium by Celsus, Theodorus by Atticus." We learn from this passage, that any person, of known intelligence, could (by permission of the Bishop) speak in the Church: the Bishop's power, in this respect, being similar to that of the Ruler of the Synagogue.

Women forbidden to preach.

7. Women were forbidden to speak in the Synagogue. "Women are relieved, not only

[f] Eccles. Hist. book vi. chap. 19.

from teaching, but also from learning.[g] The Apostle Paul, addressing the Corinthians, says; "Let your women keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak:"[h] and in the next verse; "It is a shame for a woman to speak in the Church."

Doctors sat when preaching.

8. Doctors of great name amongst the Jews sat whilst preaching, though some stood. The Christian Church reserved this liberty also for itself; but that preachers usually sat, Grotius fully proves in his annotations on Matt. xxiii. 2.

[g] Maimonides Hilcoth. Talmud Tora. Cap. 1, sect. 1.

[h] 1 Cor. xiv. 34.

CHAPTER X.

The Public Worship of the Early Church compared with that of the Synagogue.

No Liturgy of the Early Church handed down to us

WHEN comparing the worship of the Early Church with that of the Synagogue, we labour under this disadvantage, that, if the primitive Church had any liturgy, it has not been handed down to us; still, as far as we can ascertain anything of its modes of worship, we find many traces of similitude between it and that of the Synagogue; and

Prayers of the Early Church similar to those of the Synagogue.

1. In the nature of the Prayers. The prayers of the Synagogue were called *Eulogies*, because to each prayer was subjoined a benediction or thanksgiving; the prayers of the Christian Church, also, were called blessings and giving of thanks.[a] In the Synagogue, an Eulogy or form of benediction was in general subjoined to each prayer; we have every reason to con-

[a] 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16, 17.

clude, that similar was the case in the Church; thus, the Apostle Paul exhorts the Colossians,[b] "to continue in prayer, watching in the same *with thanksgiving;*" i.e. to join thanksgiving with prayer; he exhorts the Thessalonians,[c] "to pray without ceasing, in every thing *giving thanks.*" Again, the subject-matter of their prayers was similar, as far as could be expected; we have in the Schemon Esre, a sample of a Jewish prayer: and we learn from Justin Martyr and Tertullian, the nature of the Christian's; it was prayer (just like the Jew's) "joined with praise; for man's creation, for all things necessary for soul and body, for the welfare of the Church and kingdom."[d]

2. The Synagogue had its *Kaddisch* and *Keduscha;* i.e. its formulæ of sanctifying the Divine Name, and of prayer for the coming of God's kingdom; these formulæ (the Kaddisch especially) were used frequently, both before and after other prayers. The Church had its Lord's prayer similar (in some of its petitions) to the Kaddisch, and, like it, used frequently.[e] Similar formulæ in both.

[b] Chap. iv. 2.

[c] 1 Thess. v. 17, 18.

[d] "Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum ac potestatibus, pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete, pro morâ finis."—*Tertullian. Apol.* cap. 39.—Vide *Just. Apol. ad Anton.* page 60.

[e] "Quoniam tamen Dominus prospector humanarum necessi-

Customs of the Synagogue introduced into the Church.

3. Several customs observed by the Jews at prayer, were followed by the Early Christians. The Jews were accustomed to wash before prayer,[f] so were the Early Christians; the Apostle Paul evidently alludes to this custom when he exhorts men to pray, lifting up holy[g] hands: Chysostom expressly mentions it in his seventy-second Homily upon St. John; "Then entering into the Church, we wash our hands." The Postures and Gestures of the Synagogue were imitated by the Early Church. The Jews when praying looked towards the Temple, so did the Primitive Christians; and hence the accusation, that they worshipped the sun:[h] the Jews were accustomed to kneel in their supplications, to stand at their ordinary prayers; so were the Early Christians;[i] on the Lord's-day,

tatum, seorsim post traditam orandi disciplinam, petite (inquit) et accipietis, et sunt quæ petantur pro circumstantiâ cujusque, *præmissâ legitimâ et ordinariâ oratione quasi fundamento*, jus est superstruendi extrinsecus petitiones."—*Tertul. lib. de Oratione.*

[f] Exod. xix. 10; 2 Sam. xii. 20; Psalm xxvi. 6; Isaiah i. 16—18.

[g] ὁσίους. 1 Tim. ii. 8. *vide* Heb. x. 22.

[h] The majority of the Churches, whose records have reached us, were to the west of Jerusalem; they therefore turned to the east in prayer, and hence (according to Tertullian) the suspicion that they worshipped the sun.—*Apol.* cap. 16.

[i] "Quando autem *stamus ad orationem*, Fratres dilectissimi, vigilare et *incumbere ad preces* toto corpore debemus."—*Cyprian. Serm. VI. de Orat. Dom.*

however, and on certain feasts, kneeling was not permitted; "Whereas there are some, who on the Lord's-day, and on the Pentecostal days, kneel in prayer; in order that all things may be alike in every parish, it has seemed fit, to the Holy Council, that all *shall stand in prayer*."[k] Clement of Alexandria, thus describes the gestures used by Christians in prayer; "We extend the head and hands to heaven, and we stir the feet, in the latter part of the prayer; . . . . . endeavouring to lift the body from the earth, we as it were force the mind, elevated through a desire of what is better, to progress in sacred things, with a lofty soul, despising the chain of the flesh."[l] How similar to the gestures of the Jews as described by Buxtorf:[m] "In the portion of this prayer (viz. the Schemon Esre), which they call the Keduscha; when they come to the words — 'Holy! Holy! Holy! is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory!' they raise their eyes to heaven, in order to excite greater devotion; they move the whole body, trembling, as it were, on account of the tremen-

[k] Can. Concil. Nicæn. "Die Dominico, jejunicum nefas ducimus, vel *de geniculis adorare*: eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecostem usque gaudemus."—*Tertul. de Coron. Mil.* cap. iii.

[l] Strom. lib. vii. p. 519.

[m] Synag. cap. x. p. 208.

dous holiness of God, and at the same time they leap up (as if about to equal themselves to the angels who first produced this hymn, or as if about to ascend to God); immediately, however, leaping back, because it is impossible either to approach to God, or to attain to his nature and essence in this mortal life."

Responses and Ejaculations of the Church similar to those of the Synagogue.

4. Responses and Ejaculations were used in the worship of the Synagogue; similar were introduced into the Christian Church: for instance, the response, *Amen*, which was a response of the Synagogue, and also one of the Early Church.[n] In the ritual of the Synagogue, there were hortatory ejaculations to which the people replied; some of which were introduced into the worship of the Church. "Therefore the Priest, before the prayer, in a short preface, prepares the minds of his brethren by saying; 'Lift up your hearts;' that when the People answer; 'We lift them up unto the Lord;' they may be thus admonished, that they ought to think of nothing but the Lord."[o] In the Liturgies, which, though falsely ascribed to St. James and St. Chrysostom, are yet of great antiquity, we find other ejaculations and responses, corresponding exactly to those of the Synagogue.[p]

[n] 1 Cor. xiv. 16; Rev. v. 11—14. Justin Mart. Apol. xi. page 98.

[o] Cyprian. Sermon VI. de Orat. Domini, p. 242.

[p] See pages 70 and 71.

5. There was public worship in the Synagogue three times a day; the same custom was retained in the Primitive Church, as appears from an allusion of Clement of Alexandria; "Although some appoint certain and defined hours of prayer, as, for instance, the third, the sixth, and the ninth; yet he who is endued with knowledge prays throughout his whole life."[q] Worship in the Church and Synagogue three times a day.

All through the East, and in some of the Western Churches, both Sabbath and Lord's days were observed; thus Eusebius lauds the piety of Constantine who kept both days holy;[r] and there is the following exhortation in the Clementine Constitutions; "Keep holy the Sabbath and the Lord's day, since on the one, we commemorate the creation, on the other, the resurrection."[s]

With respect to the mode of reading the Scriptures in the Church, there was in many points a similarity to the mode of reading in the Synagogue. The Scriptures themselves were divided into Lessons,[t] analogous to the Paraschioth of the Synagogue; there were the larger divisions or "Chapters,"[u] and the smaller, called "Verses."[x] The Scriptures were read from a desk or pulpit placed in the middle of the The Reading of the Scriptures in the Church.

[q] Strom. lib. vii. page 519.
[r] Lib. iv. De Vitâ Const. cap. 18.
[s] Lib. vii. cap. 24.
[t] Ἀναγνώσματα.
[u] Κεφάλαια.
[x] Περικοπαὶ.

Church, after the manner of the pulpit in the Synagogue; Sozomen calls it, *the pulpit of the readers.*[y] As in the Synagogue, even youths were permitted to read;[z] whilst in both Synagogue and Church, women were strictly forbidden to speak; "Let your women be silent in the Churches," saith the Apostle Paul.[a] During the reading of the Scriptures, the Congregation stood, after the manner of the Early Synagogue;[b] and hence, Sozomen strongly censures the conduct of the Bishop of Alexandria; "Whilst the Gospels are reading, the Bishop does not stand up: such conduct I have neither seen nor heard of in any other place."[c] After the reading of the Scriptures there was a sermon.[d]

There was, however, a remarkable difference; in the Synagogue, the reader was confined to a

[y] Βῆμα τῶν ἀναγνωστῶν.—Hist. Eccles. lib. ix. cap. 2.

[z] "Aliquid de pœnitentiâ dicere divinitus jubemur, neque olim nos istum Psalmum cantandum lectori imperavimus, sed quod Deus censuit nobis utile ad audiendum, hoc cordi etiam puerili imperavit."—*August. Homil.* XXVII. lib. 50. There is in this a marked difference between the Temple, and the Church and Synagogue; in the Temple, every ceremony, every part of the service, had its peculiar officer set apart for its performance; not so either the Synagogue or the Church; in both, there was much in which the congregation were expected to join.

[a] 1 Cor. xiv. 34. [b] Nehemiah viii. 6.

[c] Eccles. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 19.

[d] Ferrarius de Sac. Conc. lib. i. cap. 15.

certain portion of Scripture, namely, the portion appointed for the day: not so in the Church, the preacher could order a portion of Scripture to be read, corresponding to the subject of his sermon; sometimes the Readers opened the book as it were at random, and read in the place where they had opened.[e]

[e] Ferrarius de Sac. Conc. lib. i. cap. 17, 18.

CHAPTER XI.

Refutation of the Arguments of those who derive the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church from the Temple.

Archbishop Usher's opinion as to the origin of Church Government.

OF those who hold the opinion, that the Government and Ceremonies of the Church were derived from the Temple, there is none more deserving of notice than the celebrated Archbishop Usher, who thus states his views upon the subject:—"Episcopacy is founded, partly, upon an exemplar prescribed by Jehovah himself in the Old Testament; partly, upon an imitation of the same introduced by the Apostles in the New, and confirmed by Christ himself. Under the old dispensation, the Government of the Church was committed to Priests and Levites, whom the Ministers of the Christian Church succeeded, just as the Lord's day did the Sabbath; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet respecting the calling of the Gentiles;

"And I will also take of them, for Priests and for Levites, saith the Lord."[a] No one doubts that the Priests were superior in order to the Levites, and that the Priests were not all equal in rank, nor even the Levites.[b] The Levites were divided into three families, the Gershonites, the Kohathites, and the Merarites; over each of these the Lord placed a Leader.[c] The Priests were divided by David into twenty-four courses, each course having its Chief.[d] These Chiefs of the courses are called, in the New Testament, the Chief Priests; evidently distinct from him who was the type of the great High Priest, that entered into the heavens, even Jesus the Son of God. Nay more, we read in the book of Nehemiah of two Bishops who lived at Jerusalem; the one, Bishop of the Priests; the other, of the Levites: of these one is styled Episcopos by the Seventy;[e] the other is called by the same name, and in the Latin Vulgate is styled Episcopus;[f] and this rendering is supported by Scriptural authority, a Hebrew word of the same origin being rendered by the word Ἐπισκοπὴν in the "New Testament."[g] At the end of his disser-

[a] Isaiah lxvi. 21.

[b] 1 Chron. xxiv. 6, 31; Ezra viii. 29.

[c] Numb. iii. 24, 30, 35.

[d] 1 Chron. xxiv.

[e] Neh. xi. 14.

[f] Neh. xi. 22.

[g] Psalm cix. 8; Acts i. 20. Usher in Opusculo de Episcoporum et Metropolitarum Origine, p. 1, 2.

tation, the Archbishop observes; that Eleazar, the son of Aaron, was appointed the Chief over the Chief of the Levites;[h] and as he is styled in the Septuagint Version an EPISCOPOS,[i] that the title *Archbishop* may be applied to him; nor does he omit the testimony of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians,[k] where the Apostle compares the preachers of the Gospel with those who formerly served the altar. Archbishop Usher's opinion, then, may be summed up in these few words; "There were Priests and Levites to perform the Temple service; these, the Priests and Deacons of the Christian Church succeeded; the Priests had their Bishops, answering to the Bishops of the Christian Church; the Levites had their Bishops, corresponding to our Archdeacons."

His opinion supported by the authority of the Fathers.

That this opinion is supported by the authority of the Fathers, cannot be denied; as early as the second century, the Presbyters of the Church were called "Priests" (HIEREIS), the Deacons "Levites," the Communion-tables "Altars," and the gifts placed thereon "Oblations."[l] In the fourth century, these appella-

[h] Numb. iii. 32. [i] Numb. iv. 16.

[k] 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.

[l] Apostolic Canons, Can. 3, 4. Cyprian, lib. i. Epist. 2, 3, 4. Tertullian, de Baptis. cap. 17. Irenæus, adv. Hæres. lib. iv. cap. 34. Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, ad Anton.

tions had become quite familiar; but, perhaps, none of the Fathers declares his opinion more distinctly than Jerome, who thus concludes his celebrated letter to Evagrius: "What Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the Temple, the same, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are in the Church."[m]

Reasons that probably induced the Fathers to institute a comparison between the Church and the Temple.

The reasons which induced the Fathers to institute a comparison between the Christian Ministry and the Jewish Priesthood, were most probably the following:—1. The Bishops and Deacons in the New Testament were the Governors of the Church, the Administrators of sacred things, just as were the Priests and Levites under the Old Dispensation; and there is evidently an analogy between Bishops and Deacons, and between Priests and Levites, in reference to the relationship they bear to each other; the Deacons being the Ministers of the Bishop, just as the Levites were the appointed Ministers of the Priest. 2. The whole worship of the Christian Church is sometimes delineated in Scripture, by language derived from the worship of the Temple; and the Ministers of the Church, though never directly styled

[m] "Et ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de vetere Testamento: quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi et Presbyteri et Diaconi vindicent in Ecclesiâ."

Priests and Levites, are yet distinguished by titles evidently borrowed from the Temple. 3. The primitive mode of administering the Lord's Supper added much weight to the analogy; each communicant offered at the holy table, bread, wine, oil, money, &c.:[n] of these, part was for the communion; the remainder was applied to the relief of the poor brethren, and (as the Church had at that time no stated income) to the support of the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. "The faithful, in these primitive times, seldom approached the altar (on Lord's days and festivals) without gifts and offerings, unless their means were so limited that they could not do it without inconvenience; these gifts were called *oblations*, which the Priest, having received from the hands of the faithful, offered on the altar to God, and blessed with certain prayers."[o] Now, these offerings were, in some respect, similar to the offerings of the Temple; in both cases they were the support of God's Ministers; and as the Bread and Wine at the Lord's Supper represented the Saviour's body and blood, hence the offering of these elements, by each individual, came (by an easy figure) to be called the offering of a sacrifice,

[n] Tertull. Apol. cap. 39.

[o] Gabriel Abalspinæus, Observat. Eccles. cap. 5.

and at length to be really thought one; and then the Communion-table was looked upon as an Altar, the officiating Minister as a Priest (Hiereus), the Deacons as Levites; and the whole scheme of the Jewish Temple was engrafted upon the simple worship of the Christian Church. 4. The hatred, which the Early Christians bore towards the Jews, is another reason why they would studiously avoid, in their worship, all conformity to the Synagogue, and imitate rather the worship of the Temple (now no longer in existence); we have on record several instances of this ill will; thus Casaubon, when mentioning how Christians used the word *Synaxis* instead of *Synagoga*, tells us that they did it, that their assemblies might be different even in name from the Jewish Synagogue."[p] There are many Canons, prohibiting Christians from any intercourse with Jews, especially in religious matters:[q] and Chrysostom, in his orations against the Jews, vehemently exhorts Christians neither to admire their sacred rites, nor to visit their Synagogues. And 5. If the early Christians discarded the Synagogue through hatred to the Jews, they adopted the Temple to please the Gentile con-

[p] Exercitat. xvi. ad Annal. Baron.

[q] *Vide* 70th and 71st Apost. Can. and Can. xi. Concil. Constantinop. in Trullo.

verts, who were familiar with denominations derived from the Temple: their anxiety to conciliate the Gentiles is too evident from the many names transferred from Paganism to Christianity.[r] The above, in a greater or less degree, were the reasons why the primitive Christians preferred their worship being compared with that of the Temple, rather than with that of the Synagogue; and when their houses of Prayer, instead of being humble buildings, became stately palaces; when they were adorned with altars, on which was exhibited a daily sacrifice for the remission of sins; when one Priest was raised in rank far above all others, and had his College of Cardinals corresponding to the great Sanhedrim; when in its orders, its ceremonies, its vestments, its rites and doctrines, the Church had departed furthest from the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus; then, its analogy with the Temple became complete, and we need not wonder that, from this date, writers of Ecclesiastical history refer the forms and rites of the Church to the Temple rather than to the Synagogue.

Analogy between Priests and Levites, and between

We will now consider the force of the arguments brought forward by those who derive the orders, ceremonies, and customs of the Church from those of the Temple. In the first place, they

[r] *e. g.* Sacraments, Mysteries, &c.

say, that there is a striking analogy between Priests and Levites, and between Bishops and Deacons, in the mutual relationship of each; that, as the Levites were consecrated to serve the Priests, so were the Deacons set apart to serve the Presbyters. We admit the analogy, but deny that it proves any thing; there can be no congregation, no assembly, whether for civil or religious purposes, in which we shall not find this relationship, viz. of persons ministered unto, and persons ministering: even amongst the Heathens, there were the Superior and Inferior Priests and their Ministers: but further, when we admit the analogy between the Church and the Temple in this respect, we assert that there is a much stronger one between the Church and the Synagogue; for in the latter case, there is not only the analogy in the relationship, but the orders themselves are called by the same names, and the offices to which they are set apart have the same designations; something more, then, than the analogy above mentioned is necessary to prove the derivation of the Church from the Temple.

Bishops and Deacons no foundation for deriving the Church from the Temple.

In the second place, they say, that there is an analogy between the duties fulfilled by the Priests and Levites in the Temple, and those fulfilled by the Presbyters and Deacons in the Church. Thus it was the duty of the Priests to

Analogy between the duties of the Priests and Levites, and those of the Bishops and Deacons, not suffici-

ent to prove the derivation of the Church from the Temple.

teach the people, the same duty was assigned to the Presbyters of the Church; it was the duty of the Priests to offer up prayers, the same was done by the Presbyters; it was the Priests' office to bless the people, the same was done by the Bishops and Presbyters of the Christian Church: and again, it was the duty of the Levites to minister unto the Priests, to take care of the gates of the Temple, to sing praises during the sacrifice, and to instruct the more ignorant; all which duties were transferred to the Deacons of the Church. Let us consider the force of this argument. No doubt the Priests were the appointed interpreters of the law, but then not at all in a sense analogous to that, in which the Presbyters were the preachers and expounders of the Gospel.[s] With respect to the second point of the analogy, we deny that the Priests offered up stated prayers for the people in the sanctuary; no such duty was ever assigned to them; whereas it was always considered the duty of the Presbyter to recite the prayers in the congregation:[t] that the Priests blessed the people is agreed, and certainly the Bishops of the Church did not omit this important duty.[u] It appears then that, in this latter point, and in

[s] *Vide* Appendix, Note E.

[t] Justin Martyr, Apol. ii. ad Anton. pp. 97, 98.

[u] See Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom.

this alone, the analogy holds good; whereas, in the Synagogue, there was the blessing of the people, the constant reading of the Law and the Prophets, and the offering up of prayers with the congregation, in all which it agreed with the Church. The latter part of the analogy, viz. that between the Levites and Deacons, we admit (at least as far as the Early Church is concerned); but still insisting that the analogy is more close, the connexion more intimate, between the Chazzans of the Synagogue, and the Deacons of the Church.

The designation of Christian Worship by phrases borrowed from the Temple, no foundation.

It is urged in the third place, that in the Sacred Scriptures the worship of the Christian Church is sometimes expressed by phrases borrowed from the worship of the Temple; thus it is predicted of the Eunuchs and the Sons of the Stranger: "Them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar."[x] The prophet is speaking in this passage of the times of the New Dispensation, and predicts, that an event shall take place, which was utterly impossible under the Mosaic Dispensation; viz. that Eunuchs and strangers shall be chosen as Priests by the Lord. Again, speaking of the future conversion of the Egyptians, the prophet

[x] Isaiah lvi. 7.

declares; "The Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it."[y] We meet with similar expressions not only in Isaiah, but in Zechariah, in Malachi, in the Psalms, and also in the New Testament; thus; "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an *holy priesthood,* to offer up *spiritual sacrifices* acceptable to God by Jesus Christ:"[z] and the Apostle Paul exhorts Christians, "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased."[a] It is evident then, that the worship of the Christian Church is compared in Scripture with the sacrifices of the Law; but certainly it does not follow from such comparison, that the worship of the Church was in any way to be similar to that of the Temple.

Meaning of such phrases.

When the writers of the Old Testament designate the worship of the New Dispensation by expressions borrowed from the worship of their times, it is not that they would have us conclude that the Christian Church was to be in these points similar to the Jewish; no, they used these expressions, in order that they might be understood by the people amongst whom they lived;

[y] Chap. xix. 21. [z] 1 Pet. ii. 5.
[a] Heb. xiii. 16.

for instance, when Israel was in bondage to the elements of the world, that mode of worship which consisted in the offering of sacrifices was the one chiefly known and received; when, then, the prophets were about to predict that God should be worshipped and adored throughout the whole world, they could not declare such an event to the people of their day, more clearly, than by some such description as the following; that sacrifices should be offered by all people; that all nations should go up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord; that Sabbaths, New Moons, and Festal days, should be observed with all diligence, &c. This way of speaking is simple and natural, and of course merely means, that God should be worshipped throughout all the earth with a suitable worship, without any reference to its form. This appears from an evident example; Isaiah and David, when predicting that Christian Magistrates would give honour to the Messiah, are accustomed to describe this event by saying, that Kings and Queens would be in subjection to his kingdom. Now, if any one would infer from this, that the civil polity under the New Dispensation was to be conformable to the form of Government of the Jews, he would be far indeed from the mind of the prophets; they merely wished to convey to us, that the Magistrates and Princes of the Gentiles

would be converted to the religion of Jesus, without any reference to a form of Government; and they designated all by the name of Kings, because this was the usual form of government amongst Eastern Nations. And, similarly, when the Prophets predict, that "Sabbaths,"[b] "New Moons,"[c] "the Feast of Tabernacles,"[d] shall be observed in the Kingdom of Christ; when the Apostle Paul tells us, that "the Feast of the Passover"[e] is to be kept by Christians; they do not mean that the Church of the New Dispensation is to be tied down to the observance of Feasts, and New Moons, and Sabbaths; the Apostle tells us quite the contrary.[f] Such expressions mean, that the Church of the New Dispensation should worship God, with a worship similar in kind, but not in form, to that which was offered to him, on Sabbaths, New Moons, &c. Thus the Sabbath was intended for rest; the New Moons and Festivals were consecrated to joy and gladness, the former, in thanksgiving to Jehovah as the true Author of light; the latter, in remembrance of various mercies conferred upon the Jewish nation. But now that the Church is to keep a constant rest from sin and evil deeds; now that she praises

[b] Isaiah lvi. 4. [c] Isaiah lxvi. 23.
[d] Zach. xiv. 16. [e] 1 Cor. v. 8.
[f] Heb. iv. 9; xi. 16. Col. ii. 16.

God, and rejoices in him, as the Author of spiritual light, and the Bestower of all spiritual mercies; she, in this sense, keeps the Sabbath, and keeps the Feast, but then without reference to any form of worship under the Mosaic law.

The forms of the Temple the Shadow—the Reality in the Church.

This latter consideration leads us to a new answer to the argument. We mentioned that the Prophets, when describing the worship of the Christian Church, borrowed their figures from the Temple, in order that they might be the more easily understood by those amongst whom they lived: but they also intended to convey by such expressions, that, in the sacred rites of the Christian Church, there should exist the truth of all those things, of which the ancient Church contained the shadow. Thus, the worship of the Old Dispensation consisted in sacrifices; these were of different kinds, and offered in different ways: the purposes for which these sacrifices were offered were likewise various; some as a testimony of reverence towards God; some as a thanksgiving for mercies received; some to obtain pardon for sin; some to deprecate an impending evil, or to accelerate an expected good: certain times were prescribed for these sacrifices, and a certain number of victims; each of which varied according to circumstances. Now, if the ministry and form of worship of the Temple is to be introduced into the Church; as

the Christian's prayer answers to the Jewish sacrifice, so we should have a certain number of prayers, of a certain kind, at stated periods, and at stated hours, which is absurd and inconsistent with the liberty which Christ has obtained for us by his blood; there is not any commandment binding Christians to pray more on one day than on another, to recite one kind of prayer rather than another, to give up one hour to prayer rather than another. It does not follow then, because the ceremonial worship of the Temple was typical, that therefore its whole form is to be expressed in the Christian Church: nothing follows from its typical character but this; that the Church is to have the Reality, whereas the Temple had but the Shadow. Under the Old Dispensation whole burnt sacrifices were offered; under the New, they are such who present themselves to God as a living sacrifice, a sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour: under the Old Dispensation, there was the sacrifice on the day of Atonement, for the sins of the whole people; under the New, Christ is the sacrifice, by which we draw near the throne of grace, and obtain pardon for sin: under the Old, sacrifices were offered even by individuals, to deprecate evil, to solicit blessings, to give thanks for mercies received; under the New, through the sacrifice of Christ, we can offer

acceptably the sacrifice of prayer, for things needful, to deprecate evil, to give thanks with reverence. Now, when all this is to be found in the Church of the New Dispensation, there is in that Church the reality of those things of which the ceremonies of the Law were the types; but if we go farther than this, and seek in our Churches, not only the reality, but also the same forms, and the same ministry, we shall involve ourselves in difficulties and inconsistencies not easily to be overcome.

The Ministers of the New Dispensation being called Priests, no foundation for deriving orders of the Church from the Temple.

A fourth argument brought forward is; "that the ministers of the New Dispensation are either called Priests, or else are described in such language, as can only have reference to the Priesthood." Thus, in the book of the Prophet Isaiah, the Lord declares, that "he will take of the Gentiles for Priests and for Levites."[g] The Prophet Malachi predicts of the Messiah; "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness."[h] The Psalmist too, speaking of ministers of the Gospel says; "Let thy Priests be clothed with righteousness, and let thy saints shout for joy:[i] and again; "I will clothe her Priests with salvation, and her saints

[g] Chap. lxvi. 21. [h] Chap. iii. 4.
[i] Psalm cxxxii. 9.

shall shout aloud for joy;"[k] the word rendered saints being a title peculiar to the Levites.[l] And though, in the New Testament, the ministers of the Gospel are never directly called Priests, yet a passage occurs in the Epistle to the Romans, in which the Apostle compares himself to a Priest, evidently alluding to the passage from Isaiah quoted above: "Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God; that I should be the *minister*[m] of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, *ministering* (i.e. as a Priest[n]) the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."[o]

Varied application of the word Priest in the Christian Church.

Now, when we acknowledge that the ministers of the Gospel are sometimes compared with the Priests of the Mosaic Dispensation, we at the same time assert, that this comparison fails in proving the derivation of the Church from the Temple; and probably, nothing shows more clearly the views of the Sacred writers on this point, than the varied application of the term "Priest" (HIEREUS) in the Christian Church. Thus the Church of Christ, which he

[k] Psalm cxxxii. 16.

[l] Spencer, de Ur. et Thum. cap. viii. sec. 1.

[m] λειτουργὸν. [n] ἱερούργουντα.

[o] Rom. xv. 15, 16.

redeemed with his blood is called, in the New Testament, the Temple of God, our Blessed Lord is the *High Priest,*[p] and all Christians without distinction, whether ministers or people, are *Priests;*[q] "ye are an holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices."[r] Again, when it is the design of the Spirit to teach us, that Christ alone has the right of access to the Deity, through the victim prepared by himself; He is proposed to us as the Antitype of all Priests, and Christians are represented by the Israelites,

[p] Heb. iv. 14; viii. 1; ix. 11.

[q] Whenever the title of Priest is applied to any of Christ's followers, it is applied (which is a circumstance well worthy of remark) not to any particular order of Christians, but to *all* Christians. They are all without exception called, figuratively, Kings and Priests; but they are (as Christians) Kings without subjects, and Priests without a people; in reference merely to the exalted state of glory to which they are called, and to their oblation of *themselves*—their souls and bodies,—to the service of God. We are called on to present ourselves as a lively (i. e. *living*) sacrifice, in contradistinction to the victims *slain* at the altar; and as "a reasonable (i. e. *rational*) service" or sacrifice, as contrasted with the *brute beasts* offered under the Old Dispensation. This language of the Apostle is copied in that of one of our prayers after the Communion: "Here we offer unto Thee *ourselves*, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice." But the true and proper Priest, under the Gospel dispensation, is the "one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus," who is the propitiation for our sins.—*Archbishop Whately's Sermons, preached in the Diocese of Dublin*, page 99.

[r] 1 Pet. ii. 5.

who could not approach to God except through a Priest: this analogy is by no means unusual in the writings of the Apostle Paul; "He is able to save them, to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them;"[s] *to come unto God by him* is a phrase borrowed from the Israelites, who could not bring their gifts to God but through the Priest; now in this analogy, *Christ* is the *only Priest*, and *all Christians*, whether pastors, or people, are *the Israelites*. Again, in another point of view, *all Christians* are compared to the *High Priest*, when through the sacrifice of Christ, they are said to have the right and power of entering the Holiest; "Having, therefore, brethren (saith the Apostle,[t]) boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." Again, *Christians* are compared to *Priests*, their souls and bodies, offered through faith, to the sacrifice, and the blood of the Apostle, about to be poured forth for the confirmation of the truth of the Gospel, is compared to the wine which, under the Levitical law, was poured forth on the daily sacrifice; "yea, and if I be offered up (literally 'be poured out as a libation') upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all."[u] Now, this varying of the analogy is

[s] Heb. vii. 25. [t] Heb. x. 19.

[u] Phil. ii. 17. There is a similar analogy in 2 Tim. iv. 6.

in itself an evident proof, that the external form of the Church was never intended to be moulded from that of the Temple; the Temple, its officers, and ceremonies, were indeed types; but then in different ways, according to the different persons and rites with which we make the comparison; it being the Lord's will, that the one type should be truly fulfilled, in different ways and manners.

The passages above quoted from Isaiah and Romans,[x] when attentively considered, will be found not to favour the cause for which they are adduced. The ministers of the Gospel are, indeed, compared with the Aaronic Priests; but in order that the analogy be complete, the Christian congregation should be compared with the Israelites; whereas from a mere glance at the passages, it will be seen that they are compared with the Mosaic Sacrifices. The Priests and Levites brought their gifts to the Lord in pure vessels; in like manner the ministers of the New Testament (through the preaching of the Gospel) bring the nations to God, and present them as a Sacrifice offered to his glory. The people, then, in these passages, are to be looked on, not as the Antitype of Israel, but as the Antitype of the Sacrifices; and in this sense, not

[x] Isaiah lxvi. 21; Rom. xv. 16.

only every minister of the New Dispensation—appointed to preach the Gospel, and by this means to bring men to communion with God—is a Priest; but every Christian also, however humble, who by his doctrine or by the example of his life brings another to Jesus.

With respect to the texts quoted from Malachi and the Psalms, it cannot be denied that the ministers of the Gospel are styled in them Priests and Levites; but it does not therefore follow, that there were to be similar orders in the Christian Church. The ministers of the Gospel are called Priests and Levites in the writings of the Prophets, in order that there might be conveyed to the minds of the people of their times, the fact, that as there were ministers of sacred things in the Jewish dispensation, even Priests and Levites, so also in the Church of the New Testament, there should be ministers. This is all that can be fairly concluded; and it is remarkable, that not only is the analogy a very slight one, but it is very rarely to be met with in Scripture; the Priesthood, in general, typifying either Him, through whom alone we have access to the Father, or the Church, the holy Priesthood, ordained to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Christ.

Analogy between ministers

There is then but a very slight analogy between the ministers of the Christian Church,

and the Jewish Priests as distinct from the Israelites; the Fathers, indeed, in many instances, draw it out to the utmost extent, but they have no warrant from Scripture; and we oppose the analogy, sanctioned though it be by tradition, on account of the immense mischief that it has produced. Believers of primitive times (as was before mentioned,) each according to his ability, brought bread and wine to the holy table, that after the benediction of the minister they might be distributed in the Congregation, or else left for the support of the Presbyters and Deacons, and for the relief of the poor: this bringing of gifts to the Lord's table, in course of time, was called an *oblation*, the table itself an *altar*, the Bishops and Presbyters who pronounced the blessing were called *Priests* (Hiereis), the Deacons who received the gifts were named Levites. Now, although there was not the slightest foundation for all this, from the writings of the Apostles, yet for a while no mischief followed; but in course of time the sacred symbols, hitherto merely called oblations, were looked upon as *sacrifices* offered up by the Ministers of the Church, as *Priests* (Hiereis), for the forgiveness of sins. Nothing now remained, but that these symbols should be said

of the Christian Church and the Jewish Priests very slight.

to be changed into the body and blood of Christ,[y] and thus was consummated the whole mystery of the Romish Mass. In opposing then this absurdity, we oppose also the foundation upon which it is built; namely, that there are Priests in the Christian Church, in the same respect differing from the People, as the Jewish Priests from the Jewish People. We have seen that there is no ground for such a doctrine from Scripture, that it is contrary to the whole tenor of the New Testament: there we are told that Christ, by his death, has given to all believers an equal right and power of approaching to him, and to the Father through him as *their only Priest* (HIEREUS); this is the prerogative, this the blessing

[y] An order of Priests, in the ancient sense, offering pretended sacrifices, on a pretended altar, on behalf of the people, was introduced into the Christian scheme; in such utter contradiction both to the spirit and the very letter of it, that they were driven to declare the bread and wine of the Eucharist miraculously changed into literal flesh and blood, offered up, day by day, repeatedly: although the founders of our religion had not only proclaimed the perfection of the one oblation of our Lord by himself, but had even proved the imperfection of the Levitical Sacrifices, from the very circumstance of their being repeated "year by year continually;" inasmuch as "they would have *ceased*" (says the Apostle) "to be offered;" if, like the Sacrifice of Christ, "once for all," they could have "made the comers thereunto perfect."— *Archbishop Whately's Sermons*, p. 101.

conferred upon every Christian.[z] The Minister of the Church, who offers up the prayers in the Congregation, is not at all (as a Priest) the Person by whom Believers approach to God; he has no greater right to address Jehovah in prayer, than any member of his congregation,—in one sense he, as well as they, are not Priests, but must approach the Father through Christ, *their only Priest*,—in another sense, he and they are equally Priests, offering the sacrifice of prayer and praise through Jesus Christ.

Argument from a passage in 1st Corinthians refuted.

The argument that is adduced, from a passage in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, admits of a very easy answer; the Apostle says; "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the Temple? and they which wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar? even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel."[a] It is concluded from this assertion of the Apostle, that the Jewish ministry was intended as a pattern of the Christian; but surely such conclusion is untenable. The only legitimate inference from the passage is this, that as the Jewish Ministers were supported from the Temple, so should the Ministers of the Gospel live by the preaching of the Gospel—

[z] Ephes. ii. 18; iii. 12. John xiv. 6.

[a] 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14.

this is the only legitimate conclusion from the Apostle's declaration.

Conclusion. All things then duly considered, it appears, that although the moral worship of the New Testament can, in many instances, be referred to the typical worship of the Temple; yet that the Apostles in ordering a form of Government and sacred rites for the Church, did not intend that they should be conformable to the Temple; but rather derived both names, and offices, and rites, from the Synagogue, which had a worship more suitable to the state of the Christian Church. We do not deny, but that after the times of Constantine, the Churches of Christians assumed a form approximating more to the Temple, than to the Synagogue; but this fact rather favours our position; we have reason indeed to grieve that the Primitive Church so soon departed from Christian simplicity, and may justly use, in this case, the words of our Blessed Lord; "From the beginning it was not so." So far from the pomps and ceremonies of later times being an argument, that the sacred forms of the Church were derived from the Temple; that, on the contrary, this conformity between the Temple and the Church is a most sure mark of a corrupt Church. It is for this reason that we so strongly oppose an opinion that to many may appear of very little conse-

quence: for if once the Doctors of the Church of Rome can get an acknowledgment, that the disposition of sacred things, in the New Church, in no respect differs from that in the Old; they can then defend, with all speciousness, their entire Ecclesiastical Polity, which agrees in every thing, in names, and offices, and ceremonies, with the Jewish.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

Note (A.)—Page 4.

Whether the Proseucha was distinct from the Synagogue.

It has been disputed whether there was any difference between the Proseucha and the Synagogue; they who contend for a difference, consider the former to have been the place for private, the latter the place for public prayer.

The distinction however is groundless; the testimony of Philo and Josephus leaving but little doubt, that the Proseucha as well as the Synagogue, was the house of public prayer. Philo speaks of a Proseucha as being a suitable place for the erection of a statue to the Emperor;[a] Josephus makes mention of one which was a very large building;[b] the Proseucha in each case being evidently the place of public prayer: Juvenal, too, uses the word in the same sense; "Tell me where you stay, in what *begging place* (Proseucha) shall I seek you?"[c]

[a] Embassy to Caius, p. 784.

[b] Life of Josephus, sec. 54.

[c] "Ede ubi consistas, in quâ te quæro Proseuchâ."
Sat. iii. lin. 287.

The Jews at Rome were notorious mendicants ;[d] hence, by an easy figure, their place of public meeting, their house of prayer, came to denote the public assembly of mendicants, the place in which the beggar was sure to be found.

Two passages in the New Testament have been supposed, by some commentators, to present to us the Proseucha as distinct from the Synagogue ; one, where our Saviour is said to have passed the whole night, *ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ* ;[e] it is contended that in this passage, the Evangelist informs us of the place in which our Lord passed the night, viz. in a Proseucha ; a corresponding passage,[f] however, makes it appear, that it was the design of the Sacred Writer to set before us the manner, rather than the place, in which our Lord spent the night.

The other passage occurs in the Acts ;[g] " On the Sabbath-day we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made," *οὗ ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ εἶναι.* It is contended that *προσευχὴ* is here the place of prayer ; and that the expression in the 16th verse, " as we went into the Proseucha," *προσευχὴν*, strongly favours this interpretation. This rendering, however, cannot be adopted, without doing great violence to the word *ἐνομίζετο* ; it is certainly to speak without meaning to say, " where there was usually a Proseucha ;" it may be said that the verb refers to the *river*, near which these Proseuchæ were usually built ; but this is not strictly correct, for though the Jews frequently built their houses of prayer near the water-side, they built them very often in cities, far from any river : for these reasons, we prefer the usual rendering of the word, and translate the passage according to the Authorized Version, " Where prayer was wont to be made."

[d] " Hic ubi nocturnæ, Numa constituebat amicæ.
Nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur
Judæis ; quorum cophinus fœnumque supellex.
Omnis enim populo mercedem pendere jussa est
Arbor ; et ejectis *mendicat* Silva Camœnis."
Sat. iii.

[e] Luke vi. 12. [f] Matt. xiv. 23. [g] Chap. xvi. 13.

Note (B.)—Page 10.

The Libertines.—Acts vi. 9.

There are various opinions as to who were the Libertines mentioned in this passage ; it is most probable, that they were either Jews who had been brought as slaves to Italy and afterwards had obtained their freedom, or freedmen of the Roman nation who had embraced Judaism. Several things are in favour of this opinion ; 1st. The word Libertinos used by St. Luke is a Latin word, it cannot therefore be a general name, including (as some suppose) the Alexandrians, Cyrenians, &c. ; had it been the Sacred Writer's intention to class these latter under the head of freedmen, he would have used the word ἀπελεύθερος, or some kindred word. 2dly. The Alexandrians, Cyrenians, &c., mentioned in the text, though all of them Jews, yet were not natives of Judæa ; may we not fairly conclude the same of the Libertines ? 3dly. Philo, Josephus, and Tacitus, testify that Jewish Libertini resided in Italy, and especially at Rome, in considerable numbers ; Tacitus, in the second book of his Annals,[h] informs us, that in the reign of Tiberius (a little time before our Lord commenced his ministry) there were in Italy at least four thousand Libertini infected with the Jewish superstition. Philo, in his "Embassy to Caius,"[i] mentions, that the Jews were in such numbers at Rome, that the Emperor Augustus assigned them a place of residence beyond the Tiber ; and he adds, that most of them were Libertini. If then there were so many of this class in Italy, in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius ; it is not only probable, but almost certain, that they had a Synagogue at Jerusalem, just in the same way as the Danes, the Swedes, the French, build places of worship in London for the use of their countrymen.

Jennings, in his "Jewish Antiquities,"[k] mentions another opinion, viz. that the Libertines were so called from a city or country called Libertus, or Libertina, in Africa, near Carthage.

[h] Chap. lxxxv. [i] Page 785. [k] Book ii. chap. 2.

In support of this opinion it is urged, that Suidas, in his Lexicon, says of the word λιβερτῖνος, "*it was the name of a nation,*" and that the glossa interlinearis, of which "Nicolas de Lyra made great use in his Notes, hath over the word 'Libertini,' '*e regione,*' denoting that they were so styled from a country. It is further urged, that in the Acts of the famous conference with the Donatists, at Carthage, anno 411, there is mentioned one Victor, Bishop of the Church of Libertina: and in the Acts of the Lateran Council, which was held in the year 649, there is mention of *Januarius, by the grace of God Bishop of the Holy Church of Libertina;* and therefore Fabricius, in his Geographical Index of Christian Bishoprics, has placed Libertina in what was called Africa Propria, or the proconsular province of Africa. Now, as all the other people of the several Synagogues, mentioned in this passage of the Acts, are denominated from the places from whence they came; it is probable, that the Libertines were so too; and as the Cyrenians and Alexandrians, who came from Africa, are placed next to the Libertines in that catalogue, it is probable that they also belonged to the same country."

Note (C.)—Page 24.

The Jews' Love of Antiquity.

The Jews, ever fond of having antiquity on their side, derive some of the customs of the Synagogue from the times of the Patriarchs: thus, Maimonides puts down Abraham as the author of the Morning prayer; because it is said of him, that he "got up *early in the morning*, to the place where he stood before the Lord;"[1] he makes Isaac the author of Afternoon prayer; because "he went out to meditate in the

[1] Gen. xix. 27.

field at *eventide*;"[m] and Jacob of the Evening prayer, for "he came out of the field in the *evening*,"[n] *i. e.* from prayer, as Maimonides supposes.

Another instance of the absurdity into which they sometimes fell, through the desire of having antiquity in favour of every rite and custom, appears in the reason that they assign for the solemn recitation of the Schema morning and evening. "When the Patriarch Jacob, on the approach of death, assembled his sons in the land of Egypt, he spake to them earnestly about the unity of Jehovah, and of the path in which Abraham and his father Isaac had walked; and he then said to them; 'My sons, there may, perhaps, be among you a profane mind, which does not, in well grounded faith, receive this Article concerning the unity of God.' They all answered and said, 'Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah;' and when the Patriarch heard this, he opened his mouth and said, 'Blessed be the name of his glorious kingdom for ever and ever.' Hence, all Israelites are accustomed to use this solemn thanksgiving, after the solemn profession of the unity of the Deity."[o] The whole tradition is evidently fabulous, but it is an instance of the folly of those, who wish to have the sanction of antiquity for every ceremony and form.

Note (D.)—Page 27.

The Sabbath.

We have mentioned, that there is no provision in the Mosaic law, for regular *public worship;* but it may be urged in reply, Is not the fourth commandment an injunction to this effect? Do not the words, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy," at least imply, that on the Sabbath-day, men

[m] Gen. xxiv. 63. [n] Gen. xxx. 16.
[o] Maimon. Hilc. Keriath Schemah, cap. 1, sec. 4.

were to abstain from all work, in order that they might have the more leisure to devote themselves to the service of God? Granting this, still it fails to prove the institution of *public worship* on the Sabbath-day. An Israelite, either alone, or in his family, could fulfil the *spirit* of the commandment, by passing the day in prayer, in meditation, or in other religious exercises. But further, the *letter*, the primary intention of the Commandment, has no reference whatever to religious worship. This is abundantly evident from various passages of the Old Testament, and first from the Commandment itself: The sacred Lawgiver says; "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy;" then follows the way in which it is to be kept holy; "In it thou shalt do no manner of work," &c.; and, finally, the reason for the command is assigned, God rested from his work which he had made. So that the Commandment in fact amounts to this; Man is to cease from his work on the Sabbath-day, because on that day, God rested from his; and by this cessation from work, the day is hallowed. In accordance with this we find, that whenever the hallowing of the Sabbath-day[p] is commanded in Scripture, cessation from work is invariably mentioned as the observance of the commandment; "Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore, for it is holy unto you: every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; *for whosoever doeth any work therein*, that soul shall be cut off from among his people."[q] And again, to take a passage from one of the Prophets; "Neither carry forth a burden, out of your houses, on the Sabbath-day; *neither do ye any work:* but hallow ye the Sabbath-day, as I commanded your Fathers."[r] And that the hallowing of the day should consist in cessation from work, will not appear strange to any one who considers the manner in which the Sabbatical year was hallowed; it was not a separation of the year from other

[p] And not only the hallowing of the Sabbath, but the hallowing of any other day: thus when it is said (Exod. xii. 17), "the first day shall be proclaimed holy;" there is added, the way in which it is to be kept holy; "*Ye shall do no servile work therein.*"

[q] Exod. xxxi. 14.

[r] Jer. xvii. 22–24.

years for religious purposes, for in the context,[s] there is no mention of any religious observances; but a rest of the land from tillage; if then a year could be hallowed by a cessation from tillage, why might not a day be hallowed by a cessation from work?

The Israelite, then, who abstained from all manner of work, kept the commandment *in its letter;* we are far, however, from saying, that he would be justified in abusing the rest enjoined by sins and vicious indulgences; (the Jews were too prone to this, and are severely reproved for it by the Prophet.[t]) No, he who was a Jew inwardly, and was circumcised in the spirit, would devote this day of rest to the service of his God. Various circumstances invited the Jew to spend the day in prayer and meditation: the sacrifices were increased, a tacit admonition, that greater devotion, increased worship was expected: the day itself was a memorial of the creation, it reminded him of the deliverance from Egypt, it typified the great work of redemption. All these circumstances connected with the Sabbath, would naturally lead the pious Jew to enjoy the rest commanded, in prayer, and meditation upon the love and mercy of his God; and to feel, that this observance, though not enjoined by the letter, was comprehended in its spirit. But still, as the Jew, who brought to the Priest the accustomed sacrifice, and presented the accustomed offering, fulfilled the law in its letter; though, perhaps, the sacrifice being offered without faith, was not pleasing in the sight of God; so also with respect to the Sabbath, he fulfilled the commandment who rested from all manner of work; but he fulfilled it in its spirit, "who did not his own pleasure, on this holy day, but called the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, and honourable."

The Sabbath was not only commemorative, it was also typical; "I gave them my Sabbath, to be a sign between me and them, that I the Lord do sanctify them."[u] As the Sabbath, then, was a memorial of the material creation, so was it a sign

[s] Lev. xxv. 1, 2, &c. [t] Isaiah lviii. 13, 14.
[u] Ezek. xx. 12—20.

of the new creation; it typified that great work of grace, which, planned before the foundations of the world, revealed at the Fall, progressing during the Old Dispensation, at length was perfected, when God sanctified his people by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Hence, that rest, that cessation from work, (which Jehovah accepted from the Jew, because it prefigured the completion of Jehovah's greatest work, even the New Creation, the redemption and sanctification of sinners through Christ) no longer is, nor can be, a part of divine worship; and therefore the Sabbath, which was a Shadow of things to come,[x] and, no doubt, typified great events, must now be abolished, for these events have come to pass; the substance is present, even Jesus Christ.

The observance of the Sabbath, then, is no longer obligatory; not so, the observance of the Lord's day; every Christian is bound to keep it holy, but not *by rest*, which, under the New Dispensation, has ceased to be a part of the worship of God. The Christian will, no doubt, rest from his usual occupations; but it will only be as the means to an end; he will rest, that he may be more actively engaged in the service of God and of his Christ.—Vide *Archbishop Whately on the Sabbath.*

Note (E.)—Page 30.

In what Sense the Levites were the Teachers of Israel.

Moses, when blessing the twelve tribes, says of the Levites, "they shall teach Jacob thy judgments and Israel thy law;"[y] it was their duty then to teach Israel, and in order to this, to apply themselves to the study of the law; for this purpose, they were separated from the other tribes; and lest their

[x] Col. ii. 16, 17.

[y] Deut. xxxiii. 10.

minds should be distracted with worldly cares, no portion of the land of Canaan was allotted to them.

The instruction given to the children of Israel, by the Levites, consisted in explaining the Law in doubtful cases, solving difficulties which might occur in the dealings between man and man, and judging in controversies. Whenever, then, an Israelite had any doubt in his mind respecting the Law, or any controversy with his neighbour, it was his duty to seek the Levite. Again, the Israelites were commanded by Moses to appoint judges, and officers in all their gates, who were to judge the people with just judgment:[z] from what tribe these judges were at first selected is not recorded; but in the reign of David, we read of six thousand Levites being set apart as officers and judges.[a] Jehoshaphat too, in his reign, "set Levites and Priests, and the Chiefs of the Fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord and for controversies."[b] It appears then, that the instructions, given by the Levites, were rather judicial decisions; some of the Levites remained in the cities assigned to them, and expounded the law, and decided controversies for all who sought them; others resided in Jerusalem and the larger cities, in which they were (generally speaking) the constituted judges, and the deciders of controversies amongst the people; and acting in this capacity, they fulfilled the prediction of Moses; to pronounce judgment, in doubtful cases, being according to Scripture language "*to teach.*"[c]

Levites sometimes took up their residence in the houses of the rich, and acted both as Priests and as instructors of the children: thus we read in the book of Judges,[d] of a Levite of Bethlehem-Judah seeking a residence, and finally dwelling with one Micah, and becoming his Priest. The reason of this can be easily conceived; the Levites' portion was tithes, which the Israelites were bound by the law to give: in disturbed times, when all respect for religion had vanished, and when,

[z] Deut. xvi. 18. [a] 1 Chron. xxiii. 4; xxvi. 9. [b] 2 Chron. xix. 8.
[c] Deut. xvii. 11. [d] Chap. xvii. 9.

perhaps, the devastation of the country rendered obedience to the law impracticable; the Levites, being reduced to extreme poverty, were driven from their cities to seek the means of living; and that not only Levites experienced such distress, but Priests also, appears from the testimony of Josephus, who informs us, that in the time of Ananias the High Priest, many of the Priests being defrauded of their tithes, perished for want of sustenance.[e]

Note (F.)—Pages 58, 84, 150.

On the Titles Rab, Rabbi, &c., given to Jewish Doctors.

From the time of Hillel (the grandfather of Gamaliel the preceptor of the Apostle Paul), the study of tradition was cultivated amongst the Jews with singular care; and as the pursuit of any science grows languid, if not encouraged by rewards, titles of honour were bestowed upon those who had gone through a certain course of study. The title most usual in our Lord's time was that of Rabbi, an honour sought after by Jewish students with the most eager ambition;[f] it was conferred by imposition of hands, (though sometimes by the mere pronouncing of a form) and had its different degrees; some were advanced to the dignity of Doctors of Theology in general, and had the power of teaching, of binding and loosing, (*i.e.* of defining cases of conscience); whilst others were merely Doctors of some particular branch of Theology; some were Doctors of both Law and Theology, and thus had the power of determining any cause, whilst particular cases were assigned to others; with some the dignity continued for life, whilst upon others it was conferred but for a time. In fact, the dignity could be restricted by any conditions according to the circumstances of the case.

[e] Antiq. Book xx. chap. 8. [f] Matt. xxiii. 7.

These Rabbies were sometimes not merely Doctors, (*i. e.* persons qualified to answer questions proposed to them concerning cases of conscience,) but also *bonâ fide* Teachers, (*i. e.* they opened schools, and interpreted the Law:) in such case the leave of the Rabbi that ordained was necessary. "It is forbidden, for a Rabbi to fix himself in any place to teach, (although he and his master live in parts most distant,) without leave being obtained from his master."[g]

In Hebrew writers we meet with several names given to Jewish Doctors, viz. "Rabban" or "Rabbon," "Rabbi," "Rab," "Cacham," and "Cabar." The highest title was Rabban (in the Syriac Rabbon), which, according to Jewish tradition, was conferred on but seven persons; it was given to our Lord by the blind man,[h] and by Mary Magdalene when she saw him after his resurrection.[i]

The titles Rab and Rabbi differed in this; Rab was the title of such as had been educated, and had taken their degree, in some foreign school; Rabbi was the title of those who had graduated in the land of Judæa, and as such, was considered more honourable. These titles were evidently borrowed from the Chaldees, and hence, we never find them used before the Captivity but to designate the officers of the king of Babylon.[k]

The Jewish councils were composed of these Rabbies; each of the members was styled Cacham (a *wise man*);[l] it is likely that it is to this appellation that the Apostle alludes, when he says to the Corinthians; "Is it so that there is not a *wise man* among you? no not one, that shall be able to judge between his brethren?"[m]

Epiphanius gives another name to the members of the Jewish councils, he calls them *Apostles*,[n] and says of them,

[g] Maimonides Hilcoth Talmud Tora, cap. v. sec. 3.

[h] Mark x. 51. [i] John xx. 16.

[k] 2 Kings xxv. 8. Esther i. 8. Jer. xli. 1. Dan i. 3; ii. 48; v. 11. There is one exception to this, viz. Job xxxii. 9.

[l] *σόφος.* [m] 1 Cor. vi. 5.

[n] Hæres. lib. i. cap. 2, Hæres 30.

"They sit with the Patriarch, and remain with him night and day, for the purpose of deliberating, and suggesting those things which should be done according to law." This name was given to them, because, in the flourishing times of the Jewish commonwealth, members of the Sanhedrim were sent to the different Synagogues to inspect their condition, &c. Heinsius observes that St. Paul was, before his conversion, an Apostle of this kind.[o]

Cabar, *i. e.* "*Fellow* or *Colleague*," was the name given to those who, though raised to the dignity of Rabbi, had not, as yet, authority to pronounce judgment in controverted cases; thus Scaliger says, "After the imposition of hands, the individual is not immediately called *Rabbi*, though raised to the rank of Rabbi; but only *Cabar*, which is the same in signification as the Greek word γνώριμος, and the Latin word *familiaris*."

In the time of our Lord there was a multitude of Rabbies, so much so, that it was found necessary to enact laws restricting the promotion of persons to this rank.

Our blessed Lord was evidently a Rabbi; he was thus styled by his disciples;[p] he was addressed as one by the Jewish multitude;[q] and it is well known that the Jews gave this title to none but such as were promoted by imposition of hands; indeed we cannot easily conceive how, upon every occasion, he was permitted to speak in the Synagogue, if he had not been a Rabbi:[r] the very posture he assumed in the Synagogue is a proof that he was one; "I *sat* daily with you, *teaching* in the Temple;"[s] after he had read (in the Synagogue of

[o] Observations on Luke vi. 13.

[p] Mark ix. 5.

[q] John vi. 25.

[r] "Et tamen, quomodo in Synagogam potuit admitti, tam repentinus, tam ignotus, cujus nemo adhuc certus, de tribu, de populo, de domo, de censu denique Augusti quem testem fidelissimum Dominicæ nativitatis Romana archiva custodiunt? sed etsi passim Synagoga adiretur non tamen ad docendum nisi ab optimè cognito, explorato, et probato, jampridem in hoc ipsum vel aliunde commendato cum hoc munere."—*Tertullian adv. Marc.*"

[s] Matt. xxvi. 55

Nazareth) a portion of the prophet Esaias, "he *sat down*," and in that posture taught the people.[t]

But it is probable that not only our Lord, but that also some of his Apostles and Disciples occupied the Doctors' chair; and this is not at all surprising, when we consider how common the honour was at this time; the Apostle Paul was certainly a Doctor, the commission given to him by the Sanhedrim proves him to have been such;[u] and thus we find that when he and Barnabas entered the Synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, *they sat down*, and "after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the Synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation to the people, say on."[x] Now, it may be asked, why should the rulers of the Synagogue have invited men (wholly unknown to them, whose doctrines were consequently unknown to them) to address the people, if the Apostles had not given some indication that they had a title to speak? and what other indication is mentioned by the inspired writer, but that *they sat down?*[y]

The above observations throw some light upon a passage that occurs in the first Epistle to the Corinthians;[z] "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge; if anything be revealed to another that sitteth by (literally *sitting down*), let the first hold his peace." From this it is likely, that in the Early Church, as in the Synagogue, there were persons privileged to speak in the congregation, (probably at the first set apart by the Spirit,) and that such persons occupied the Doctors' seats.

[t] Luke iv. 20. [u] Acts ix. 2. [x] Acts xiii. 14.

[y] "Atque in hâc usurpatione *sedendi*, pro Doctoribus agniti sunt ab Archisynagogis, qui factâ legis et prophetarum lectione, admiserunt, ut si meditati accesserint verba in cœtu facerent; neque enim ritè hinc concluseris, cuivis peregrino hoc indultum fuisse, ut publice diceret; sed cum peregrini isti se Magistros profiterentur *sedendi privilegio*, præfecti Synagogæ qui nonnumquam istiusmodi, Hierosolyma accedentes audiverant ipsis id honoris detulerunt."—*Altingius in Schilo*, lib. iii. cap. 6.

[z] Cap. xiv. 30.

Note (G.)—Page 96.

On the Feast of Tabernacles.

The Feast of Tabernacles commemorated two events; the dwelling of the Shechinah in the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, (where it went from place to place, exposed to mortal eye,) and the dwelling of the Israelites in tents; this feast then, commemorated the condition (so to speak) of the Godhead as then manifested to his people, and the condition of that people. It also typified two events; the dwelling of the Godhead in the flesh, (who *tabernacled*[a] amongst us, *going about* doing good,) and the condition of the Christian Church.[b] As at this feast, the Israelites left their own habitations, dwelt in tents, and with joy and gladness drew water from the pool of Siloam, which they poured out upon the sacrifice; so in the latter times, the Church was to leave the house and family of her Father, to desert the Temple her fixed residence, to deny all external relationship, and to worship God in spirit and in truth, not bound to a particular place, but having the earth as her inheritance. And as at this feast, water was drawn from the pool of Siloam and poured upon the sacrifice; so now, Christ pours out, upon those who offer *themselves*—soul and body—as a sacrifice, his Spirit without measure; and hence our Lord himself, on the last and great day of this feast, stood and cried saying; "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink; he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water; but this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive."[c]

[a] ἐσκήνωσε, John i. 14. [b] Zech. xiv. 16.
[c] John vii. 37, 38.

Note (H.)—Page 104.

The Recitation of the Schemah.

The Jews commenced their public service by reciting the Schemah; the reason, assigned by their Doctors for this, is, that the Schemah contains a summary of all religion, whether Theoretical or Practical; the Theoretical in the words "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah;" the Practical in the words "Thou shalt love Jehovah thy God," &c.; they supposed then, that when they recited the Schemah they made a profession of the entire doctrine of their religion. But besides, the Jewish Doctors believed that there was something mysterious in the words, "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah;" they supposed that they contained, not only a declaration of the unity of the Deity, but also a prediction of the universality of his kingdom. Thus Jarchius, in his Commentary, says, "It is here predicted, that Jehovah, who is now our God, and not the God of the Gentiles, shall be, in time to come, One Jehovah; as it is written, 'For then will I turn to the Gentiles a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of Jehovah;'[d] and again, 'In that day Jehovah shall be one, and his name one.'"[e] That this is a very ancient exposition is evident from the writings of the Apostle Paul, who demonstrates the necessity of a justification by faith, from the very fact of *Jehovah's being one;* "Seeing," he says, "*God is one,*[f] which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith:" as if the Apostle would say; Since God has declared that he is one, *i. e.* the same to all men, and no respecter of men's persons; it is necessary that he bring all to life and immortality, in the same manner, and by the same means; this cannot be by the law of Moses, a law given to distinguish the Jew from the Gentile, a law whose ceremonies could not be observed by all nations; it must then be by faith.

[d] Zeph. iii. 9. [e] Zech. xiv. 9.
[f] εἷς ὁ Θεὸς, Rom. iii. 30.

Thus again in his Epistle to the Galatians:[g] "A Mediator is not of one, but God is one." Moses, the Mediator of the Old Covenant, gave to the Israelites a law by which they were separated from the Gentiles; but since Jehovah, notwithstanding this covenant, hath declared himself to be *one;* it follows that he will reunite both Jew and Gentile into one people, treat both in the same manner, and lead both to glory in the same path of righteousness. There is a similar reference in the Epistle to the Ephesians.[h] They who recited the Schemah were said to receive the *yoke of the kingdom of heaven*, because they confessed their belief in the future kingdom of God and of his Christ; whilst they who recited the text, Deut. xi. 13, were said to take upon themselves *the yoke of the commandment*, because it was a profession of their obligation to observe all the precepts of the Mosaic law. It is likely that it was in reference to this, our Lord called his Gospel *the kingdom of heaven*, and invited his hearers to take *his yoke* upon them.

Note (I.)—Page 125.

Whether the Septuagint was read in the Synagogue.

Some writers, amongst whom are Joseph Scaliger and Walton, contend, that the Septuagint Version was used in the Synagogues of the Hellenists;[i] and they build upon the fact, that the Evangelist Luke quotes from the Septuagint the passage read by our Lord in the Synagogue.[k] Now, it is

[g] Chap. iii. 20. [h] Chap. iv. 3, 4, 5.

[i] "Ἕλληνες sunt Pagani, Ἑλληνισται Judæi Græcis Bibliis in Synagogis utentes, quæ profecto est differentia Hebræorum et Hellenistarum, quos, ut dixi, certissimum est, olim et per totam Egyptum et Europam sola Biblia Græca in Synagogis legere solitas."—*Scaliger Proleg. de Versione Græc.* sec. 14. *Vide* Simeonis Hist. Crit. V. T. lib. i. cap. 17.

[k] Chap. iv. 18, 19.

not at all probable, that,—the Jewish commonwealth being still in existence, the study of the Hebrew language common, a knowledge of the Greek (as Josephus testifies) confined to a few,—the Septuagint Version would be used in a Synagogue of Galilee. St. Luke's quoting from this version can easily be accounted for; he was writing for Greeks, and in Greek, and would therefore naturally accommodate himself to his readers. But further, the Codex Sopherim expressly says; "In whatever language the sacred books may be written, no volume is used in the Synagogue, but one written in the Assyrian characters." An occurrence in the reign of Justinian is however conclusive on this point: about the middle of the sixth century, some Jews wished to introduce the Greek Version into the Synagogue; not agreeing among themselves, they appealed to Justinian, who decided "that it was better that the Scriptures should be read in the Greek, or in any other tongue which was most suitable to the audience."[1] Now, had it been the custom to use the Greek Version, its introduction in this instance could not have given rise to such contention: we are therefore of opinion, that though the Septuagint might have been used in private, it was not used in the Synagogue till the time of Justinian.

Note (K.)—Page 148.

Meaning of the Phrase—"Husband of one Wife," 1 Tim. iii. 2.

There are two opinions as to the meaning of this phrase; Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome, Calvin, Beza, &c., hold, that the Apostle had in view the polygamy common amongst the Jews, and that it was his intention to prohibit Christian Ministers from having more than one wife at a time; the other opinion is, that the Apostle prohibited second marriages.

[1] Novel. 146.

That the latter opinion is the true one appears, first, from an analogous phrase in this very Epistle; the Apostle, when giving directions about the Deaconesses, says; "Let not a widow be taken into the number, under threescore years old, having been *the wife of one man.*"[m] Now, the phrase, "wife of one man," must mean, the being married to but one husband during her lifetime; therefore, the corresponding expression, "husband of one wife," must mean, "the not having contracted a second marriage."

But, secondly, we must bear in mind, that this Epistle was written to the Bishop, not of a Jewish, but of a Gentile Church; and that, however common polygamy may have been amongst the Jews, it was not tolerated by the Greeks and Romans; Gellius fully proves that it was repugnant to the laws of Athens;[n] and Servius, in his notes on Virgil, that it was contrary to the customs of Rome;[o] it was unnecessary then for the Apostle to give the injunction as interpreted by Chrysostom and others, polygamy neither being usual amongst, nor sanctioned by, the Greeks and Romans.

Thirdly. A second marriage (at least on the woman's side) was considered disreputable by the ancients, and a single one honourable; hence, the Latin word, *Univira*, exactly corresponding to the Apostle's expression, "Wife of one husband;" hence, the boast of the female in Livy, that she was but once married;[p] hence, the expression of Dido respecting her wished-for marriage with Æneas:—

"I perhaps could yield to this one fault."[q]

And that the same feeling existed amongst the Jews, appears from the character, given by the Evangelist, of the prophetess

[m] 1 Tim. v. 9. [n] Noctes Atticæ, lib. xv. cap. 20.

[o] The following is his Commentary on the line—

"Vidi Hecubam centumque nurus."—*Æneid*, lib. ii. p. 501.

"Barbarorum fuisse plures habere uxores, aut finitus est numerus pro infinito, aut certe ideo centum, quia Barbarorum fuerat non singulas habere conjuges sed plures."

[p] "Se uni nuptam ad quem virgo deducta sit."—Lib. x. cap. 23.

[q] "Huic uni forsan potui succumbere culpæ."—*Æneid*, lib. iv. 19.

Anna; "She was of a great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity, and she was a widow of about fourscore and four years."[r]

Fourthly. Second marriages were considered indecorous by the Early Church: thus, the first Canon of the Council of Laodicæa ordains; "To those who have been joined legitimately in second marriages, and have not secretly married; after a short time has elapsed, after fasting and prayer, we again give communion." Is not the fact, of the communion being refused to those who had contracted a second marriage, a proof of the estimation in which such marriages were held by the Early Christians? Again, it is expressly stated in the Apostolic Canons (a work, which though fictitious, is decisive as to prevailing notions) "That no person is to be admitted into holy orders, who after his baptism has contracted a second marriage." Tertullian wished to impose Monogamy upon all Christians.[s] These considerations are conclusive, and prove that when the Apostle enjoined Timothy, to select as Bishops and Deacons, men who were each the husband of one wife; it was his wish, that he should reject every one who had contracted a second marriage; it is, however, to be observed, that the very circumstances (which in all probability) caused the injunction, prove it not to be universally obligatory.

Note (L.)—Page 185.

On Church Government.

Various objections have been urged, from time to time, against our Church-government, against the three orders of the Church, and the functions which they respectively exercise. To answer these merely by an attempt to prove their existence

[r] Luke ii. 36.

[s] See his Treatise on Monogamy, near the end.

in the apostolical age and their Scriptural sanction, is to allow the objector an unfair advantage, and to submit our own minds to an unfair view of the question. The proof of the contrary rests with those who object. We find these matters so established, and tracing them further and further back, we still find evidence of them, without any coincident marks of human innovation. Tried by the touchstone of Scripture, they are found to be at least not inconsistent with its records; and, therefore, it would be a wanton and dangerous exercise of the Church's discretionary power to annul them. This was the spirit of the Reformation in England; and on this principle it has taught us, Thus far shalt thou go, and no further.

There are two questions, which in a discussion of this point require distinct consideration. The first is, What were the orders of the primitive Church? The second, Were they intended altogether, or partly, or not at all, as models for the formations of ecclesiastical establishments of after-times?

As to the first question it may admit of a different answer from different periods of the apostolical history; inasmuch as the Church economy was certainly not framed at once, but rose progressively with the exigences of the Church. At the very period on which we are now dwelling, it is obvious, that the term Bishop and Presbyter were not only applied to the same order, but that no order of ministers (setting aside the Apostles) was generally established superior to the presbytery. At a later period in the apostolical history, the same assertion would be altogether untenable.

The assembly, or ἐκκλήσια, must, from its nature, have been the only order, besides that of the Apostles, on the first attempt of the Christians to act as a Society. All Christians composed this body, and the term, in short, signified the Church. But whether this general assembly at any period exercised any elective, legislative, or other powers, may perhaps be questioned. No doubt the Church or Assembly is mentioned as taking part with the Presbyters in the elections and enactments; but when we consider the immense concourse which a general meeting would suppose in the very earliest

times, is it likely that any one *private room* would be found capable of containing all? On the other hand, is it likely that in Jerusalem especially, so large a multitude would be permitted to meet *in public*, openly discuss their affairs, and take measures for the support and propagation of obnoxious doctrines, when even individuals were exposed to continual risk in their preaching and other ministry? The meetings of Christians for purposes of prayer, and other devotional exercises, must, for the same reason, have taken place in different houses assigned for the purpose. And this (as has been before observed) may illustrate the expression used by the historian in his account of Paul's search after the disciples, "in every one of the houses," (κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους;)[t] which, no doubt, implies, that he obtained information concerning their several places of meeting, and by going from one to another at the time of prayer was sure of apprehending some. The same allusion may be perceived in St. Paul's expression of "the Church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla," &c.[u] Such a division of the Christian body into separate congregations would require the appointment of some one, at least, to preside over and officiate in each; and also of some one or more subordinate ministers or deacons, such as have been before noticed. When, therefore, we read that a decree was made, &c., by the Apostles, Presbyters, and the whole Church, one of two things must be supposed to have taken place: either the Presbyters took each the sense of his own congregation; or the Presbyters and other official persons, it may be, met as the representatives, each of his own congregation, and all of the Church collectively.

The former supposition is certainly encumbered with more and greater difficulties than the latter. The subject proposed at these Christian meetings seems, from the tenor of the narrative throughout, to have been then first presented to the Church in any shape; and the decisions took place before the meeting was dissolved. There are no marks of any previous notice of the matter to be discussed, so as to enable the

[t] Acts viii. 3. [u] 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

several Presbyters to consult the opinions and wishes of their constituents ; and the decision took place without any interval to allow of an after consultation.

Against the remaining supposition, namely, that the Presbyters and other official persons, perhaps, met as the plenipotentiaries each of his own body, the strongest obstacle lies in the phrase, " It seemed good to the Presbyters with the whole Church."[x] Now this expression, after all, may imply no more than that it seemed good to the Presbyters, and whatever other members of the Council, in conjunction with them, may be called the whole Church, because appointed to represent it. In like manner, when the Council of Jerusalem declared respecting their famous decree, that, " It seemed good to them *and* to the Holy Ghost,"[y] our knowledge of the relation in which these stood to one another, prevents all doubt ; but the expression itself, without any such clue, would make it questionable, whether the Council and the Holy Spirit were not recorded as two separate sources of the ecclesiastical authority from which the decree had emanated. Now the sentences on which we ground our conjectures respecting the authority of the whole Christian body, are precisely so circumstanced.

The appointment of Deacons has been elsewhere discussed, and the origin of the Presbytery has been now suggested. The order of Bishops, therefore, only remains to be accounted for. At the period of St. Paul's summons to the Church of Ephesus, no such order could have existed there ; and, if not in so large and important a Church, probably nowhere. The *title* cannot imply it, for it is one used for all the Presbyters of Ephesus ; and their number proves that he was not addressing Bishops, for they came from one Church. Again, although the word occurs elsewhere in St. Paul's Epistles, it cannot intend one chief governor of any Church ; because his Epistles are addressed to the Churches, as to assemblies in whom all the authority was vested. The term Bishop became afterwards appropriated to an order, of which we cannot infer

[x] Acts xv. 22. [y] Acts xv. 28.

the existence, certainly from any expression of St. Luke. How such an order should have arisen, it is not difficult to discover. St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus present us with at least its embryo form. Not only are both commissioned to ordain ministers, to determine matters left undetermined, and to inflict ecclesiastical punishments, even to excommunication;[z] but their respective dioceses are distinctly marked out. Ephesus was assigned to Timothy, Crete to Titus.[a] At the same time it would certainly seem that, in Timothy's case especially, the appointment was rather that of *locum tenens* for the Apostle, and so far a temporary office. But this, far from being an objection to the apostolic authority of episcopacy, really supplies us with the clue to trace its origin and object. What was needed for a time at Ephesus or Crete, in the temporary absence of the presiding apostle, would be permanently requisite, when death for ever deprived these Churches of apostolical superintendence. The same cause, in short, which produced the appointment of Presbyters, continued, as the number of congregations in each Church increased, to render the rise of a new order equally necessary.

A small presbytery, occasionally visited by an apostle, might not require a head; but a large one, especially as the Apostles were removed by death or accident, would soon feel this want. That such an order was required before the close of the apostolic era, the then state of Christianity would render of itself nearly certain. Although at the time of the appointments of Titus and Timothy they may not have been general, yet when St. John wrote his Revelations, each of the seven Churches of Asia had its own bishop. And if this were so in that district, which then alone enjoyed the guidance of an Apostle, much more was it likely to have been the case elsewhere. St. John, we know, addressed them as *angels;* but whether by a figure of speech, or because such was at that time their only designation, no candid mind can doubt that an episcopal order is intended; and that to them, as such, commands and revelations were given by God through his last Apostle. Thus,

[z] 1 Tim. v. 22 Titus i. 5; iii. 10. [a] 1 Tim. i. 3 Titus i. 5.

episcopacy would seem to be the finishing of the sacred edifice, which the Apostles were commissioned to build. Until this was completed and firm, they presented themselves as props to whatever part required such support. One by one they were withdrawn; and at length the whole building having "grown together into an holy temple,"[b] the Lord's promise was fulfilled to the one surviving Apostle. He only tarried until God's last temple was complete, and the Lord's second "coming" unto it[c] had thus been announced by an especial vision.

There is still another point to be settled. Was this form of Church government intended to be perpetual, and universal—is it enjoined on all Christian societies in every age?

On the one hand it may be urged, that as the constitution of the Church was only what was then most convenient for the support and propagation of religion, whenever that end may be better attained by any alteration or deviation, the innovators are acting up to the spirit of the original institution, and thereby are more truly followers of the Apostles, than those who sacrificed the *object* to the observance of the *means*, which are only valuable as regards that object. Those who maintain the other side of the question may assert, that these being the means originally appointed by the Holy Spirit, through which His office as Governor of the Church was to be exercised, we have no right to alter them, any more than we are authorized to alter the means of grace, unless some positive permission can be shown; and that it is, moreover, a wicked presumption to suppose, that any other means, (however humanly probable,) would more truly obtain the object of Church government. As a reason why this form of Church government was not positively enjoined, it may be suggested, that it was not like an abstract doctrine or precept, the only safe mode of recording which is "the written word," but a matter *which is its own record.* Like the Mysteries of the heathen, it was a practical document; the daily and continual

[b] Ephes. ii. 21.

[c] See Mal. iii. 1.

practice of the Church, perpetuated from one age to another, superseded all need of other record.

Much of this latter statement is doubtless unanswerable. At the same time, it would be uncharitable and unchristian, to pronounce those to be no members of Christ's Church, who regulate their community without bishops. The particular arrangement of ministerial orders is of course the means, and the preservation of the Gospel, the end. Whether those, who have in any instance deviated from the pure apostolic practice, had cause to justify such a departure, (and such a case doubtless is supposable,) it is a matter between God and the Church itself. The case of those, too, who find themselves by birth members of such a society, is to be distinctly separated from the case of those, with whom the innovation originated.

Some departure in the form of government, from the pattern of the primitive Church, has necessarily taken place in every community, nor does this departure of itself imply presumption. A very large community, for instance, has everywhere required a new order above bishops themselves; and this need being manifest, the appointment of the archiepiscopal office is as purely consonant to the apostolical views, as that of subordinate bishops. It has arisen in the same way, and in compliance with a similar need to that which gave rise to the episcopal order, in the apostolical Church; namely, the increased extent and more complicated government of each Church. Thus, too, the appointment of catechists, once a branch of every Church establishment, was properly discontinued as soon as they ceased to be required; and as properly has been revived in our colonies, where their services are once more applicable. The choro-episcopi served, in like manner, to meet another occasional emergency.

No Church has ever more anxiously and conscientiously shaped its course by the spirit, and by the very letter of the apostolic precedents, than has the Church of England. And yet even that Church has found circumstances powerful enough to justify a deviation scarcely less momentous, in the transfer

of supreme ecclesiastical authority to the civil magistrate. It is not merely a variation from the original architecture of Christ's holy building that constitutes disproportion and deformity. We must look also to the changing features of the scene around, and see whether these have not demanded corresponding alterations, and let these be the measure of our judgment.—*Hinds's Rise and Early Progress of Christianity*, vol. i. page 345.

THE END.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

SE. WINCKLER BIN
SEP 1952

DATE DUE

BM 653 .V5 1842

Vitringa, Campegius, 1659-
1722.

The synagogue and the church

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BM653.V5 1842
Vitringa, Cam The synagogue and the chur
3 0645 0009 0236 7